PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

604691

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/thirdreportfroms0000hous

Contents.

1837 Railway Subscription list 3rd report (City railway) Page 1

" do. do. 4th (S. Mid. Counties —— 177

" do. do. 5th (Remnies) (Direct London & Brighton) —— 329

" do. do. 6th (S. Eastern, Brighton &c.) —— 554

" do. do 7th (Brighton — Stephensons) —— 588

THIRD REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

RAILWAY SUBSCRIPTION LISTS;

TOGETHER WITH THE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

City or Southwark Bridge and Hammersmith Railway.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
27 *June* 1837.

Mercurii, 22° die Februarii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the matters of several Petitions, complaining of the Names of certain needy and indigent Persons having been inserted in the Subscription Lists of several Railways, and praying for Inquiry into the Case of the Deptford and Dover Railway Subscription List; and to whom several Petitions containing similar allegations were particularly referred.

Martis, 1° die Martii, 1837.

A Committee was nominated of,—

Mr. Warburton.
Mr. Dugdale.
Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Aaron Chapman.
Mr. Charles Lushington.
Sir Eardley Wilmot.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. John Young.
Mr. Daniel Gaskell.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. George Evans.

Ordered, THAT the said Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers and Records

Ordered, THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Mercurii, 19° die Aprilis, 1837.

Order [1st March] that Five be the Quorum of the Committee, read, and discharged.

Ordered, THAT Three be the Quorum of the said Committee.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to report their Opinion, together with the Minutes of the Evidence taken before them, from time to time, to The House.

Veneris, 21° die Aprilis, 1837.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Dugdale, Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. John Young and Mr. George Evans be discharged from further attendance; and that Mr. Chalmers be added to the Committee.

THE REPORT - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - p. 1
APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - p. 141

THIRD REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE to whom have been referred sundry Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contracts of certain Railway Companies, and, among these, the following Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contract of the City of London Railway Company; viz.

1st. That of Richard Lill, of Vauxhall, Grocer, complaining, amongst other things, that the Promoters of the said Company have obtained many Persons to subscribe the Parliamentary Contract Deed of the said Company for Sums far beyond the means of such Subscribers to pay; that among the names of the Subscribers appear those of many needy Persons, notoriously unable to meet their liabilities under the said Deed, some of whom, at least, were induced to subscribe by the payment to them of a small Commission by other parties, who were unwilling to incur the responsibility of executing the Deed themselves; and that several others of the Subscribers have been Bankrupt, and have taken the benefit of the Act for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors: Presented 16 Mar.

2d. That of the Directors of the said Company, denying that they or any of them have induced any person to sign the said Deed, who was, to their knowledge, unable to meet his liabilities; or that any part of the Funds of the said Company has been given to any Person to induce him to subscribe his name to the said Deed: Presented 17 Mar.

3d. That of William Robinson Chamberlain and of William Algernon Lens Piercy, denying that they or either of them, as is alleged in the Petition of the said Richard Lill, have signed the said Deed otherwise than in the usual way: Presented 20 Mar.

4th. That of the Directors of the said Company, complaining, among other things, that the said Richard Lill was induced to present his Petition at the instance of the Directors and Promoters of the Southampton Railway Company: Presented 20 Mar.

5th. That of Joseph Dandridge, denying that the charges contained in the said first Petition of the said Richard Lill apply to him: Presented 20 Mar. 1837.

6th. That of the said Richard Lill, stating under what circumstances he was induced to sign his said first Petition, and desiring that the same may not be proceeded with, and that he may be permitted to withdraw the same: Presented 21 Mar.

7th. That of Francis Thomas Bircham, of 52, Lincoln's-Inn Fields, Solicitor, and Clement Francis, of 63, Lincoln's-Inn Fields, stating under what circumstances the said first Petition of the said Richard

Lill was drawn up by the said Francis Thomas Bircham, and submitted by the said Clement Francis to the said Richard Lill for approval; and stating, on the part of the said Francis Thomas Bircham, that he believes the allegations in the said first Petition of the said Richard Lill to be true:

Presented 4 April.

8th. That of the London and Southampton Railway Company, stating that they believe that all the allegations in the said first Petition of the said Richard Lill are true; and praying that the said Petition may not be allowed to be withdrawn, but that the same may be inquired into by the Select Committee to whom the same stands referred, and that they may be allowed to appear by their counsel, agents and witnesses in support of such of the allegations in the said Richard Lill's first Petition, as they may conceive it to their interest to assist in the investigation of:

9th. That of the Directors of the City of London Railway Company, accusing the London and Southampton Railway Company with being instrumental in imposing the said first Petition of the said Richard Lill on The House:

10th. That of Henry Luard, complaining of the Directors of the City of London Railway Company having abandoned their intention of making a Branch Railway to Richmond:

11th. That of Charles John Blunt, complaining that the Directors of the said City Railway Company do not intend, really and in good faith, to prosecute their Bill:

And who were empowered to report their Observations, together with the MINUTES OF EVIDENCE taken before them, from time to time, to The House;——HAVE taken Evidence on the matters adverted to in the said Petitions, or having reference thereto, and have heard the observations made on such Evidence by the Counsel for the Petitioners, 7th, 8th and above mentioned; and after considering the whole of the premises, have agreed to the following REPORT:

IN this their Third, as in their two preceding Reports, Your Committee will begin by stating the principal facts of the case which appear to them to stand in Evidence.

The project of forming a Company to obtain an Act of Parliament for
10990. making a Railway to unite the whole of the Metropolitan Railways, and to
11374. run from Southwark Bridge, through Lambeth and Vauxhall, by a bridge across the Thames at Battersea, to the Great Western Road, between Kensington and Hammersmith, and thence to join the Birmingham Railway at Hardlesdon Green, with a Branch to Richmond, was set on foot by
10989. Mr. William Laxton, the present surveyor and engineer to the Company, in conjunction with Mr. Charles John Blunt, lately the engineer to this Com-
11000. pany, in the month of October 1835. They consulted together how to form such a Company from the time above mentioned to March 1836. From almost
11036. 11038. the commencement of this period, Mr. J. Binns also, lately Secretary to the Board of Directors, had been acting in concert with Mr. Laxton and Mr.
11001. 11010. Blunt. In March they consulted with Mr. Francis Beetham, and placed the
11040. solicitorship of the proposed Company in his hands. These four persons, Mr. Laxton, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Binns and Mr. Beetham, applied to persons to belong

to

to and form a Board of Direction, which, in an advertisement making known the general objects of the proposed undertaking, was announced to the public on the 9th of March 1836. The Directors, as advertised, were,

Hans Busk, Esq.;
Albert William Beetham, Esq., F.R.S.
Richard Cooke, Esq.
Henry Charles Dakeyne, Esq.
James C. Disney, Esq.
Thomas Smith Good, Esq.
Robert Hay Graham, M.D.
Augustus William Hillary, Esq. (who accepted, but afterwards withdrew).
The Honourable Warwick Lake, now Lord Lake, (who never acted, and has since withdrawn).
Admiral Maitland (since deceased).
Donald Maclean, Esq., M.P. (added by mistake, and whose name was withdrawn the 15th March 1836). 11063.
Major Macnamara, M.P. (has attended only once, and has not signed the deed). 11074. 11103.
The Honourable Frederic W. Mullens, M.P. (has not signed the deed). 11104.
Captain Frederic Polhill, M.P.
Sir William Rawlins.
John Henry Walker, Esq.
John St. Leger, Esq. (afterwards added to the Board).

The bankers announced were Messrs. Whitmore, Wells & Whitmore. Messrs. Laxton and Blunt were announced jointly as the engineers and surveyors.

Messrs. Laxton and Binns engaged an office for the Company, at No. 9, Mansion-house-street, where the first meeting of the Directors took place on the 17th of March 1836. 11113. 11093.

In this first advertisement, the capital for the Undertaking was estimated at 1,000,000*l.*, to be raised in 20,000 shares, of 50*l.* each, the deposit per share being 2*l.* At subsequent periods, several parts of the proposed Line of Railway have been successively abandoned: 1st, the Branch to Richmond, estimated at 150,000*l.*, by abandoning which, prior to the deposit of the Plan in the Private Bill Office, the estimated cost was reduced to 850,000*l.*: 2d, In the Committee upon the Bill, that portion of the Line which lies between Southwark Bridge and the Waterloo Bridge Road, and which was estimated at 270,000*l.*, was directed to be struck out, which would further reduce the estimated cost to 580,000*l.* But 850,000*l.* being the estimated cost, as deposited in the Private Bill Office, it is to that sum that Your Committee will make reference in inquiring whether the Subscription List has been executed in compliance with the Standing Orders. 11030, 11031. 11374. 11390. 11394.

Although to offer any opinion to the House on the accuracy of this estimate, would not exactly fall within the province of Your Committee, yet the estimate being the groundwork on which is founded the amount to be raised under the subscription contract, it became matter of incidental inquiry, whether the personal character and professional eminence of the persons employed by the Directors as their civil engineers, afforded *primâ facie* grounds for placing confidence in the accuracy of their estimate. Mr. Laxton and Mr. Charles John Blunt were joint engineers to the Company. Mr. Laxton has not studied or been employed under any civil engineer; his practice has been confined to 11125 & prospectus. 11137. 11138.

10120. that of a building surveyor. About 10 years ago he was an auctioneer. Previous
11130. 11149. to the bringing out of the Company he surveyed the whole Line of Railway at
10993, 10994. his own expense; his Plans have been submitted to and approved by Mr.
11595. Hoskins, a civil engineer, who is prepared to support them before the Com-
11155. mittee on the Bill. Mr. Laxton first became acquainted with Blunt in July
1835. Blunt was in the employ of Sir John Rennie during the building of
11596. London Bridge, and is the author of a work, intituled, "The Civil Engineer."
11157. Subsequently to July 1835, Mr. Blunt became a bankrupt, and has not yet
10845. 10896, 10897. 11160 to 11170. received his certificate. He resigned his situation as engineer to the Company in March last. From reading the Evidence he has given, the House will be able to judge what degree of confidence ought to be reposed in his testimony.

11030, 11031. In the advertisement of the 9th of March 1836, applications for shares were directed to be addressed to Mr. Francis Beetham, the solicitor, or to Mr. J. Binns, the secretary of the Company. The limit fixed for receiving applications for shares was the 30th of March. The Directors, assisted by Mr. Beetham, Mr. Laxton and Mr. Blunt, appropriated the shares. They took great pains, they state, to allot the shares to parties they deemed respectable; and in consequence of the inquiries they made, rejected many of the applications; 27,755 shares were applied for by 1,054 applicants, to 165 of whom no shares were allotted. To 889, who applied for 23,153 shares, 17,051 were allotted.

11174 to 11177. 11601.

The 20th of April was the day assigned for paying the deposits. On 9,583 shares, deposits amounting to 19,166*l.* have actually been paid: of that number, only 8,751 have been signed for on the deed.

11608.

11195. Other parties than the original allottees of shares were allowed to sign the deed, namely, the holders of the bankers' receipts for the payment of the deposits, whosoever they might be. These holders, on signing the deed, received their scrip-certificates. The subscribers' agreement, which they were also required to sign, contained a clause, that shares in the capital of the Company should not be transferable, until authorized by Act of Parliament; but many of those who signed had obtained the shares they held by transfers made to them, or previously made to others, of either letters of allotment or of bankers' receipts, before the signature of the deed. It was to no purpose, therefore, that pains had been taken by the Directors to allot the shares in the first instance to persons whom they considered as respectable; since not only those allottees, but also their assigns, and the assigns of those assigns to any extent, were permitted by the Directors to affix their signatures to the deed. On their first coming out, in April 1836, those shares on which no deposit had been paid, were at from 1*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* premium; those on which the deposit of 2*l.* had been paid, were at that time wholly unsaleable. They had fallen to a discount in July, when they were to be purchased at from 20*s.* to 30*s.* In December and January last they had fallen to 5*s.*, and since that period to from 1*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.*

See Appendix, No. 13.

11264. 12414. 12429.

11273. 11435. 11281.

12416. 12418. The secretary of the Company, Mr. J. Binns, in October and November last, was engaged, by advice of a sharebroker, named John Edward Stokes, in a series of transactions, the object of which appears to have been, by buying up the shares for time, and thus creating an artificial demand for them, to counteract that depression which they had sustained in the market. To cover the risk attending one of these operations, he is stated to have lodged the Company's deed as a security with a broker, and for so doing to have been discharged from the Company's service. The Directors represent that

12402 to 12846.

12507.

Binns

Binns had been speculating in shares on his own account, and that immediately on this coming to their knowledge, he was dismissed. 11632. 11636. 11637.

Your Committee beg to state, that no evidence has been adduced in support of that allegation, contained in the first petition of Richard Lill, that some of the needy persons who are alleged to have subscribed the deed, were induced to do so in consideration of a small commission; but evidence has been adduced in support of another allegation contained in the said petition, that among the subscribers to the said Undertaking, there appeared the names of many needy persons who are totally and notoriously unable to meet the liabilities under the said subscription deed; and although the proof of this allegation rests mainly on the testimony of persons who are themselves in needy circumstances, and have been engaged in transactions similar to those which they have in this and the two preceding inquiries disclosed, yet no attempt has been made to contradict their testimony in support of the latter allegation; and Your Committee see no reason to disbelieve the more material parts of that testimony.

According to the Evidence given,

Jacob Nunez Castello, who signed the Kent Railway deed, for money, has signed the City Railway deed for	75	shares	£. 3,750
Charles Fraser, who signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway deed, for money, has signed the City Railway deed for	30	—	1,500
John Morgan, who signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway deed, for money, has signed the City Railway deed for	30	—	1,500
William Algernon Lens Piercy, who signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway deed, for money, has signed the City Railway deed, for	50	—	2,500
William Robinson Chamberlain, who signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway deed, for money, has signed the City Railway deed for	10	—	500
Francis Drake, is in Whitecross-street Prison (9293. 9296), and a person named Edmunds, and not Drake, signed Drake's name to the deed (11647)	100	—	5,000
Henry Gunson, is in Whitecross-street Prison (9273), and is in indigent circumstances (9270), signed for William Baker (9279. 10779)	100	—	5,000
James Macarthy, has taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act (10955), and has signed the deed for another person (9947)	50	—	2,500
John L. Crawford has taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act (10960)	20	—	1,000
George Wilson has taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act (10006)	15	—	750
Henry Sibley has taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act 10457), and has signed the deed for Mr. George Brown (10453)	50	—	2,500
John Edward Stokes has taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act (9418)	80	—	4,000
Joseph Levy (*see* Evidence 9329 to 9336	30	—	1,500
Joseph Dandridge (*see* Evidence 9353 to 9358)	135	—	6,750
Gustavus E. Beckers (*see* Evidence 9364 to 9372. 10635, 10636. 10761. 10763)	60	—	3,000
Samuel Carr (*see* Evidence 9379 to 9384)	150	—	7,500

Silous Crisp (*see* Evidence 9403 to 9405) - - - -	25	—	-	£. 1,250
William Cooke (*see* Evidence 9432 to 9444. 10508, 10539. 10571. 10619. 10667) - - - - -	80	—	-	4,000
Robert Blackmore (*see* Evidence 9479, 9490) - - -	35	—	-	1,750
Peter Mudie (*see* Evidence 9491. 9495) - - - -	35	—	-	1,750
John Dickenson (*see* Evidence 9497. 9503) - - -	10	—	-	500
John Jackson (*see* Evidence 9513, 9514. 9522) - -	100	—	-	5,000
Robert Wood (*see* Evidence 9848 to 9854) - - -	10	—	-	500
John Vaughton (*see* Evidence 9855 to 9860) - - -	20	—	-	1,000
William Burnett Bloxam (*see* Evidence 9867 to 9876. 10797)				
— signs as William Bloxam - -	35	—	-	1,750
— signs as William Burnett - -	15	—	-	750
Thomas Christopher Meason (*see* Evidence 9861 to 9864)	20	—	-	1,000
William Hamilton (*see* Evidence 9892 to 9901) - -	80	—	-	4,000
William Dorrington (*see* Evidence 9917 to 9929) - -	60	—	-	3,000
William Constantine (*see* Evidence 9932 to 9938) - -	5	—	-	250
Richard Gurney (*see* Evidence 10969. 12042 to 12071) -	100	—	-	5,000
Robert Brine (*see* Evidence 9954 to 9960) - - -	10	—	-	500
Thomas Ford (*see* Evidence 9961. 9964) - - - -	10	—	-	500
Joseph Amadio (*see* Evidence 9965. 9970. 10662) - -	10	—	-	500
John Symes (*see* Evidence 10027. 10930. 10932) - -	20	—	-	1,000
	1,665	—	-	£. 83,250

Besides the foregoing names, which are liable to exception on account of the insufficient pecuniary responsibility of the parties, there are others which are subject to objection on the ground, that not those who signed, but others for whom they did so, (but without stating that fact on the deed itself,) are the parties who are really interested in the shares; and, consequently, that the subscriptions in question are not *bonâ fide* subscriptions.

The first of this second class of cases belongs to certain shares which were signed for by certain parties on behalf of Mr. William Laxton, the surveyor and engineer of the Company. He states that the officers of the Company, and
11203. he among the rest, were required by the Directors to take a prescribed number
11204. of shares, on which they were to pay the deposits when it was convenient to them. The number he was required to take was 150, on which he paid the
11225. deposits on the 13th of January. To avoid constituting himself in law a
11211. partner, which he would have done by signing the deed, and in which case he
11296. would be precluded, if occasion required, from suing the Directors, as well as to prevent objections being taken to his evidence as an interested party, on matters of inquiry before the Committee on the Bill, he requested the following parties to sign for him in their names, which they did; the transaction taking place,
11519. 11522. it appears, with the privity of Mr. Beetham, the solicitor of the Company:

Henry Laxton (*see* Evidence 10404. 10407. 10491) signed for	50	shares	-	£. 2,500
W. J. Northhouse (*see* Evidence 11,228) - - ditto	50	—	-	2,500
Henry Daniel Martin (*see* Evidence 11228. 11517 to 11567) - - - - - - ditto	50	—	-	2,500

11230. In the last fortnight in January, it being considered advisable that every
11231. exertion should be made to get rid of a few more of the shares that had been reserved for the landed proprietors, Mr. Laxton agreed to take 151 more
11284. shares, at 40 *s.*, although they were then selling in the share market at only 5 *s.*, and proposed to pay the deposits on those shares, out of the sum due to
16596. him for professional services. He received, on the 15th of March, a draft from

from the Directors for 302*l.*, which he paid in to the bankers of the Company, on account of the deposits on the 151 shares, and for these shares he induced his friends to sign, in the following manner:

Henry Holland (*see* Evidence 10263 to 10333) - - -	30 shares	- £.	1,500
William Blofield (*see* Evidence 10107 to 10133. 11293. 11339)	36 —	-	1,800
Henry Miller - - - - - - - - - - -	30 —	-	1,500
Thomas Arnold (*see* Evidence 10142 to 10208. 10245) -	30 —	-	1,500
—— Mills (not included in the subscription contract) -	25 —	-	1,250

16899.

Mr. Beetham, the solicitor of the Company, appears also to have been privy to the nature of this arrangement. Some of the parties signing the deed in each of these transactions with Mr. Laxton were not persons of adequate pecuniary responsibility.

10299. 10308.

Two transactions of an entirely similar nature, and corresponding dates with those of Mr. Laxton above stated, took place between the Directors and Mr. Charles John Blunt, their engineer. In the first of these transactions, two drawing clerks in his employ, of the names of George Harris and John Hurle, signed for 75 shares, 3,750*l.* each, with the privity of Mr. Beetham. In the second transaction with Blunt, he engaged to receive 150 shares, on which the deposit of 2*l.* was paid, the price at the time in the market being only 5*s.*, to be reckoned as 300*l.* cash, in part payment of his professional services. These shares, with the privity of the Directors, were to be signed for by Charles Fly Blunt, the father of the engineer. They were in fact signed for in the following manner:

8964 to 9072. 9115. 9142. 9200. 10077. 9036 to 9047; 10049 to 10106.

8997. 8999. 10057.

16581.

Felix Blunt, brother of the engineer to the Company, of age last February, and not equal, as he states, to the payment of the money for which he signed, signed for 50 shares - - - - - - - - -	£.	2,500
Charles Fly Blunt, father of the engineer to the Company, who took the benefit of the Insolvent Act last August, signed for 100 shares -		5,000

11723 to 11760. 10849.

10843. 12363 to 12376.

Besides these cases in which Mr. Laxton and Mr. Blunt were concerned, there occurs in the deed the signature of Archibald Kerr, who signed in his own name, but on behalf of Mr. Dalrymple, a wine-merchant, for 50 shares, 2,500*l.*

The aggregate amount of this second class of cases is 326 shares, 16,300*l.*; which, added to the amount of the first class of cases, being 1,665 shares, 83,250*l.*, makes a total of 1,991 shares, 99,550*l.*, which, it appears to Your Committee, are not of the nature of *bonâ fide* subscriptions.

The moiety of the estimated capital, as deposited in the Private Bill Office, is 425,245*l.*

	£.
The amount of the subscriptions contained in the subscription contract, is - - - - - - - - - - - -	437,550
From which, if there be deducted - - - - - - -	99,550
There will remain the sum of - - - - - - - £.	338,000

which is deficient by the sum of 87,245*l.* of the moiety required by the Standing Orders.

27 *June* 1837.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Jovis, 15° die Junii, 1837.

PRESENT,

MR. WARBURTON, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. D. Gaskell.
Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. Lushington.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. Thornely.

Report read, considered, and agreed to.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Jovis, 27° die Aprilis, 1837.

Mr. George Harris - - - p. 1
Mr. Thomas Green - - - p. 8

Veneris, 28° die Aprilis, 1837.

Mr. Thomas Green - - - p. 20
John Hurle - - - - - p. 28
William Blofield - - - - p. 30
Thomas Arnold - - - - p. 31
Henry Holland - - - - p. 35
Henry Laxton - - - - p. 37
Mr. Henry Sibley - - - p. 38
William Cook - - - - p. 41

Sabbati, 29° die Aprilis, 1837.

Mr. William Wentworth - - p. 45
Mr. Daniel Edward Stephens - p. 50
Mr. Joseph Beaumont - - - p. 53
Mr. William Yewings - - - p. 54
Mr. William Laxton - - - p. 59
Mr. Henry Daniel Martin - - p. 79

Lunæ, 1° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. William Laxton - - - p. 81
Robert Fillingham - - - p. 87
Mr. Felix Blunt - - - p. 88
Mr. Daniel Edward Stephens, pp. 92. 104
Mr. Frederick Bozon - - - p. 99
Mr. William Laxton - - - p. 100

Martis, 2° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. William Laxton - - - p. 104
Mr. Francis Beetham - - - p. 106
Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham - p. 106
Mr. William Yewings - - - p. 113
Mr. Charles Blunt - - - p. 114
John Edward Stokes - - - p. 115

Jovis, 4° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Charles John Blunt - - p. 123

Jovis, 11° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Francis Beetham - - - p. 138
Mr. William Gethen - - - p. 138
Mr. H. C. Dakeyne - - - p. 138

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Jovis, 27° *die Aprilis*, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

CITY RAILWAY.

The Petition of Richard Lill, presented the 16th March 1837, and the second Petition of Richard Lill, presented the 21st March 1837, in which he prays to be allowed to withdraw his first petition, were read.

Mr. *Hill* stated, he appeared on behalf of the Southampton Railway Company, and on behalf of Mr. Bircham and others, praying to be allowed to tender evidence in support of the allegations in the first petition of Mr. Lill.

Mr. *Phillips*, who appeared on behalf of the Southwark and Hammersmith Bridge Railway Company, contended that no person, unless by Mr. Lill's authority, ought to appear in support of the petition of Mr. Lill, and that Mr. Hill, appearing for other parties, could not be heard upon the allegations of that petition.

The *Chairman* stated, that the House had not permitted Mr. Lill to withdraw his first petition; but had referred it to this Committee, to inquire into the truth of the allegations contained in it: that it was for the purpose of aiding the Committee in their inquiries that counsel and agents were allowed to appear at all; and that Mr. Hill might examine into the allegations of those petitions on behalf of the parties for whom he appeared.

The Petition of the Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Bridge Railway Company was read.

Mr. *Phillips* appeared as counsel in support of the petition.

The Petition of William Robinson Chamberlain and William Algernon Lens Piercy was read.

The Petition of Francis Thomas Bircham and Clement Francis was read.

Mr. *Hill* appeared as counsel in support of the petition.

The Petition of the London and Southampton Railway Company under their common seal was read.

Mr. *Hill* appeared in support of the petition.

Mr. *Hill* stated he should make no opening speech, but proceed at once to examine the witnesses, reserving to himself the right, under the direction of the Committee, of making observations to the Committee in summing up the evidence.

All the witnesses, except the professional gentlemen, were directed to leave the room till called for.

Mr. *George Harris*, called in; and Examined by Mr. *Hill*, as follows:

Mr. *George Harris*.

27 April 1837.

8964. WHAT are you?—An architect.

8965. Are you a clerk, or were you a clerk a short time ago, in the office of Mr. Charles Blunt?—Yes.

 8966. Was

Mr. *George Harris.*

27 April 1837.

8966. Was he the engineer to the Southwark and Hammersmith Company?—He was.

8967. May I ask what was your salary?—I received 30*s.* a week.

8968. Were you a drawing clerk?—Yes.

8969. At any time had you any conversation with Mr. Blunt respecting the subscription deed?—I had at one time.

8970. How long ago?—Since January.

8971. Then would it be in the early part of February?—I cannot say exactly.

8972. Just tell us as near as you can; was it before the petition was presented for the Bill?—Yes, it was.

It was admitted on both sides that the petition for the Bill was presented the 3d of February.

8973. Tell us what took place?—Mr. Blunt wished me to sign the deed.

8974. What did he say to you?—To oblige him.

8975. Tell us what he said to you as nearly as you can?—I do not recollect anything but that.

8976. What?—To sign the deed to oblige him.

8977. What were you talking about?—The City Railway.

8978. This railway was called the City Railway then?—Yes.

8979. Where was this conversation?—It was during the same time.

8980. Where was it?—In Cheapside.

8981. Was it at Mr. Blunt's own office?—No; it was during the time we were going from his office in a cab to the City Railway-office.

8982. What were you going for?—To sign the deed.

8983. Something must have occurred before that?—Nothing whatever.

8984. What were you going for?—With him to sign the deed.

8985. What had he said to you before?—That he wanted me to go with him.

8986. You then got into a cab together?—Yes.

8987. And went along Cheapside?—Yes.

8988. Was the railway office in Cheapside?—Opposite the Mansion-house.

8989. What did he say to you?—He told me to sign my name on the parchment, which I did.

8990. To oblige him?—Yes.

8991. What did you say to that?—I said I had no objection to it.

8992. You then came to the office?—Yes, to the office.

8993. You are not at the office at present, you are in the cab; after you agreed to sign, you got to the railway office?—Yes.

8994. Who did you see there?—Two or three gentlemen.

8995. Did you know any of them?—No, I did not know any of them.

8996. You knew none of them?—No, not to my knowledge.

8997. You must tell the truth just as if you were upon your oath?—

Chairman.] You are not asked if you were intimately acquainted with them, but if you knew who they were.

Mr. *Hill.*] Come, Mr. Harris.

I think that gentleman was one, next to Mr. Betham.

8998. Mr. *Phillips.*] This gentleman [*pointing to Mr. Gethen*]?—Yes.

8999. Mr. *Hill.*] William Gethen?—Yes.

9000. Come, now, you see you have sharpened your recollection; is there any other?—No, I cannot say for any other.

9001. Should you know them again if you were to see them?—I think not.

9002. *Chairman.*] Have you ever seen any of the other parties since your meeting with them at that room?—No.

9003. Mr. *Hill.*] Had you ever seen any of them before?—Not to my knowledge.

9004. Had you ever been in the railway office before?—Never.

9005. You say you saw Mr. Gethen?—Yes.

9006. Had you any transaction with him; tell us what took place?—If it were Mr. Gethen, he handed me the deed to sign.

9007. What did he say to you?—He wished me to sign it for 75 shares.

9008. He said he wished you to sign it for 75 shares; had anything been said about 75 shares before Mr. Gethen said so?—Mr. Blunt mentioned it; he wished me to sign for 75 shares.

9009. *Chairman.*]

9009. *Chairman.*] He mentioned the number 75, did he?—Yes.

9010. Mr. *Hill.*] When was it Mr. Blunt mentioned anything about the numbers; was it before you got to the office?—Yes, it was.

9011. What did he say to you about the number of shares you were to subscribe for?—I recollect nothing more than that he wished me to sign for 75 shares.

9012. Then Gethen said, he wished you to signed for the 75 shares; tell us all that you recollect about it?—Nothing more passed.

9013. *Chairman.*] After Mr. Gethen desired you to sign for 75 shares, tell us what took place?—I signed my name and address for 75 shares, 50 *l.* per share.

[*The Subscription Deed was produced, and handed to the Witness.*]

9014. *Chairman.*] Read so much of the line which is in your own handwriting, and then read the remainder, not in your handwriting?—"George Harris, 12, Aberdeen-place, Maida-hill, architect; 75, number of shares; 3,500 *l.*, sum subscribed." That is in my own handwriting

9015. What is there in the line subscribed, not in your handwriting?—"W. Gethen."

9016. As the attesting witness?—Yes.

It appeared there was no column for deposits upon the deed.

9017. Mr. *Hill.*] What time in the day was it?—I think it was one o'clock.

9018. You said there were other gentlemen there besides Mr. Gethen and Mr. Blunt; was there any conversation among those gentlemen as to the number of shares you were to sign for?—No, there was not.

9019. There was no conversation among them at the office?—None whatever, to my knowledge.

9020. Are you quite sure of it? Come, Mr. Harris, refresh your memory a little.—I do not recollect that there was any.

9021. Have you never said that there was?

Mr. *Phillips* objected to the Witness being treated as a hostile witness.
Mr. *Hill* was heard in support of the question.
The Committee decided that the question might be put.

9022. Mr. *Hill.*] Now recollect, Mr. Harris, and say whether you have not said that there was conversation in the office about the number of shares that you were to sign for, among the gentlemen present?—Not to my knowledge.

9023. Do you mean to say there was no such conversation to your knowledge, or that to your knowledge you have not said that there was? Do not alarm yourself; speak the truth, and you have nothing to fear.—It is not to my knowledge that I said that there was.

9024. And it is not to your knowledge that there was such conversation?—No.

9025. Did you pay any deposit?—I did not.

9026. Have you any shares in this undertaking?—None whatever.

9027. Had you anything more to do with this undertaking, either before or at that time or since, but simply to sign the deed?—Nothing.

9028. Had you any scrip or bank receipt or appropriation letter, or anything of the kind?—I had not.

9029. Did you ever apply for shares?—No.

9030. Your salary, I think, you say, was 30*s.* a week?—It was.

9031. Do you know John Hurle?—Yes.

9032. Was he a fellow-clerk of yours?—Yes.

9033. Have you used to work in the same room?—We have.

9034. Had you any conversation with him after you returned?—I had; I mentioned to him whether he thought any harm would result from it. He said, none.

9035. What else did he say?—He did not say anything else.

9036. Did Mr. Gethen come to Mr. Blunt's office shortly after? Was it the day you signed the deed?—It was.

9037. On that day Mr. Gethen came to Mr Blunt's office?—Yes.

9038. Was Mr. Blunt at home?—Yes.

9039. Did Mr. Blunt tell you to send up Hurle into his private room?—He did.

9040. Did Mr. Hurle go while Mr. Gethen was there?—Yes.

 9041. How

Mr. *George Harris.*

27 April 1837.

9041. How long was he absent?—A quarter of an hour.

9042. When he came back again, did he tell you what he had been doing?—He told me he had signed the deed.

9043. Did you ask him for how much?—No, I did not.

9044. Did he tell you how much?—Yes.

9045. How much?—Seventy-five shares.

9046. Did he tell you whether he had paid any money on receiving any shares?—No; he told me he had not received any shares.

9047. And he told you that he did not pay any money?—Yes.

9048. What else did he say; was there any conversation as to there being any danger or fear about it?—He said there was not the least fear about it.

9049. Did he say why?—No, he did not.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Phillips.*

9050. Who was this gentleman that was saying all this to you about the shares?—Mr. Hurle.

9051. What is he?—A fellow draughtsman to me.

9052. Is he in the room?—I do not see him.

9053. Have you had any conversation with Mr. Blunt about the evidence you were to give here to-day—[*the Witness hesitated*]—you hear me?—Sir.

9054. Did you not hear the question?—No.

9055. Have you had any conversation with Mr. Blunt upon the evidence you were to give here?—No.

9056. You never spoke to him about it?—No.

9057. Is he in the company's service?—I believe not.

9058. Do you not know it?—I saw it by an advertisement in the Times newspaper.

9059. When did you see Mr. Blunt last?—I have not seen him since last March, when I left him.

9060. Last month?—Yes.

9061. What time in last March did you see him?—In the beginning.

9062. After some of these petitions had been presented?—Yes.

9063. Do you know from him whether he was at that time in the service of the company in March last?—No, I do not.

9064. You were his own clerk?—Yes, I was.

9065. Are you in his service still?—No, I am not.

9066. Did he discharge you?—Yes.

9067. When?—Last March.

9068. Why?—He had no further use for my services.

9069. But he did not tell you, being discharged by the company himself, it was not necessary for him to employ a clerk any further?—No, he did not.

9070. Did he give you any reason?—No.

9071. Do you mean to tell the Committee you did not know whether your own master was discharged at that time or not by the company?—Yes, I do.

9072. And never heard a word of it till you saw the advertisement?—Yes.

9073. How long is it ago?—A fortnight ago, I think.

9074. Did not Mr. Blunt tell you, as the engineer to the company, he had taken a great many shares himself?—No, he did not.

9075. You never heard of it?—No.

9076. He did not tell you he had paid the deposits upon the shares?—No.

9077. Have you ever seen your master write?—Yes.

9078. Just tell me if that is Mr. Blunt's writing [*handing a paper to the Witness, marked A.*]; just look at his name, it is not necessary to read the whole letter; look at the name signed to it; do you believe it to be his handwriting?—Yes, I do.

[*Another paper was handed to the Witness, marked B.*]

9079. Do you believe it to be his handwriting?—Yes.

[*Another paper was handed to the Witness, marked C.*]

9080. Do you believe that to be his handwriting?—I could not swear to it.

9081. What is your belief on it; you are not asked to swear to it; are you reading it?—No, I am not.

9082. Look at the signature of Mr. Blunt, and tell me whether you do not believe it to be written by him?—I do not believe it to be written by him.

9083. Do

9083. Do you say that deliberately?—It does not appear to be like his writing.

9084. Will you tell the Committee whether you believe it to be his writing or not, yes or no; do you mean to adhere to your answer, that you do not believe it to be his handwriting?—The word "Blunt" does not look like his writing.

9085. Then you do not believe it to be his handwriting?—I cannot answer that question.

9086. *Chairman.*] What is your belief upon the subject?—

Mr. *Phillips.*] Do you believe it, or do you not believe it?—

"Charles John" looks like his writing.

9087. Take the three names together, "Charles John Blunt;" do you believe that to be Mr. Blunt's handwriting?—I should say it was his writing.

9088. What is it that has made you say it was his handwriting, when you told me this instant you did not believe it was? Did you read any portion of the letter?—No.

9089. What was it induced you to give me a different answer to what you did two minutes ago; can you give any reason?—No, I have no reason.

[*Another paper was handed to the Witness, marked D.*]

9090. Do not give a hasty opinion about it, but look at it. Do you believe that to be Mr. Blunt's writing?—Yes, I do.

9091. Is Mr. Blunt alive?—I do not know.

9092. You have not heard of his death?—No, I have not.

9093. Do you mean to say you do not believe, not only that he is alive, but in good health?—I hope so.

9094. Do you not believe it?—I believe it.

9095. Did you ever see any receipt of Mr. Blunt's from this company?—Never.

9096. You mean to say you never heard Mr. Blunt say he had paid upon all these shares?—No.

9097. You never asked him?—No.

9098. Did it not strike you, when asked to sign for 75 shares, to ask Mr. Blunt why he asked you; it was the first time it had occurred?—Yes.

9099. Why did not you ask Mr. Blunt what was the reason he wished you to do it?—I thought it was my duty to sign the deed.

9100. Do you mean to tell this Committee seriously you thought it your duty to sign the deed for 75 shares, you not getting one, or paying a deposit upon one?—I thought it strange.

9101. As you thought it your duty, and thought it strange, did you not think it your duty to ask Mr. Blunt why he wished you to sign it?—Yes.

9102. Did you do it?—No.

9103. Why did you tell me just now you thought it your duty to sign it; did you say one word to him why he asked you to sign?—No.

9104. Did you ask him if you were to get the shares?—No.

9105. Did you ask him if he had shares to that amount?—No.

9106. Did you ask him whether he had paid upon them?—No.

9107. Now, attend to me. Do you mean to tell the Committee that this gentleman (*Mr. Gethen*) ever named 75 shares to you?—I will not swear to that gentleman.

9108. You have said it to Mr. Hill already; will you stick to it; will you venture to say he ever named to you any number of shares; is it not utterly false that this gentleman ever named 75 shares to you; after my learned friend told you to tell the truth, did you not state that direct falsehood, that this gentleman, Mr. Gethen, mentioned the 75 shares you were to sign for?—(*No answer*).

9109. Did you not state to my learned friend, Mr. Hill, that this gentleman who sits beside me named 75 shares to you?—I thought so.

9110. Did you not state so to him?—I thought so.

9111. Did you not say so?—I did not decidedly say it was him.

9112. Do you mean to say you did not in distinct terms tell this gentleman that Mr. Gethen had named 75 shares to you; do you mean to say that? did you not tell Mr. Hill he named 75 shares to you?—I do not know whether it was that gentleman or not.

9113. Did you not tell Mr. Hill positively that it was that gentleman?—Not positively.

Mr. *George Harris.*

27 April 1837.

9114. I understand you now to say, you will not say that this gentleman said so?—No, I will not.

9115. Whose employment are you in now?—I am no one's.

9116. How do you get your living, if you are in no one's employment?—What little business I have of my own.

9117. What are you?—An architect.

9118. Business as an architect?—Yes.

9119. Who did you do business for last as an architect, since you were discharged from the office of Mr. Blunt?—Mr. Hornblower.

9120. Where does he live? Now, mind, do not let us make a mistake: do you mean that since you left Mr. Blunt's employment Mr. Hornblower has given you business as an architect?—Yes; he gave me business for a few days while I was with him.

9121. Is that the only business you have done since?—Yes; I have been out of employment since.

9122. What might be the amount of your receipt from him for the few days you were with him?—I cannot call to mind the exact amount.

9123. About how much was it?—I received two guineas a week.

9124. You say you were only there three or four days: do not talk of weeks: how much did you get?—I do not know.

9125. Do you mean to say that?—Yes.

9126. How long ago was it you received any money, if you received any?—A fortnight; not quite so much.

9127. Do you mean to say that you cannot tell how much you received a fortnight ago, for only three days?—(*No answer.*)

9128. Do you know Mr. Bircham?—I have seen him.

9129. Do you know him?—Yes.

9130. When did you see him last?—To-day.

9131. Did you see him yesterday?—No.

9132. Or the day before?—No.

9133. Do you mean to say that, at Lincoln's Inn-fields; when were you last at his office in Lincoln's Inn-fields?—I should think it was a fortnight ago.

9134. Of course you have got no money from him since you were dismissed by Mr. Blunt?—No.

9135. That you positively state?—Yes.

9136. Nor from any person in his employment?—No.

9137. You do not know any of the Southampton directors?—No.

9138. Nor their solicitor?—No.

9139. Have you named now the only person that employed you since you left Mr. Blunt?—Yes, he was the only man.

9140. Mr. Hornblower?—Yes.

9141. Did you receive any money from anybody else, by which you could maintain yourself?—No.

9142. How did you maintain yourself?—I am residing with my friends.

9143. Have they maintained you?—Yes.

9144. What made you say it was by business of your own; did you not tell me you had business of your own, as an architect, by which you maintained yourself?—Yes, I had some.

9145. I confined you to the time since Mr. Blunt discharged you; did you not say so? did not I desire you to name some person that employed you, and did you not name Mr. Hornblower as the only person?—Yes.

9146. When were you examined first upon this business?—I was never examined before.

9147. When did you tell anybody of what evidence you were to give; perhaps you have never told anybody of it? did you ever tell anybody what evidence you were to give?—No.

9148. Now you deliberately say that to me, that you never told anybody whatever what evidence you were to give? Now look this way: do you mean deliberately to say that; if you are wrong, correct it?—I asked Mr. Bircham what evidence I was to give.

9149. Look in this direction; why are you every moment looking at Mr. Bircham. You asked Mr. Bircham what evidence you were to give?—Yes.

9150. Did he tell you what evidence you were to give when you asked him?—I do not recollect what he said.

9151. Did he say anything to you when you asked him what evidence you were to give?—He said that I should say I was obliged to sign the bill to oblige Mr. Blunt.

9152. He said that to you?—Yes.

9153. He told you, you were to say you signed the bill to oblige Mr. Blunt: was that what Mr. Bircham said to you? Look this way: that you were to say you signed the bill to oblige Mr. Blunt; was that what he said to you?—I do not recollect him saying that.

9154. Did you not tell me this instant he said so to you; that he told you you were to sign the bill to oblige Mr. Blunt. Did you not say so in the presence of the Committee?—I do not recollect him saying anything more.

The former answer of the Witness was read to him.

9155. Is that correct which has been read to you?—I believe it is.

9156. When Mr. Bircham told you you were to say that Mr. Blunt desired you to sign the bill to oblige him, what answer did you give?—He said that that was all that was necessary that I should say.

9157. You are sure that was his answer?—Something to that effect.

9158. Then I suppose you left Mr. Bircham's office?—Shortly after.

9159. And you have now stated all that passed between you on the subject?—Yes.

9160. Did you go to Mr. Bircham, or did he send for you?—He sent for me.

9161. Who is the person that went for you?—Mr. Green.

9162. Do you see Mr. Green here?—No.

9163. *Chairman.*] Do you know his christian name?—No, I do not.

9164. Mr. *Phillips.*] Was he in the room when Mr. Bircham had this conversation with you?—Yes.

9165. Was he a clerk of Mr. Bircham's?—Yes.

Re-examined by Mr. *Hill.*

9166. You say that Mr. Bircham sent for you?—Yes, he did.

9167. Was it Mr. Green that came for you?—Yes, Green was the name.

9168. Did Mr. Green take you to Mr. Bircham's office?—He did.

9169. Before you went to Mr. Bircham's office, did you tell Green anything about what you had been doing in signing the deed?—Yes, I did.

9170. Did you give Mr. Green the same account you have given to these gentlemen to-day, or any other account?—I gave him the same for ought I know.

9171. Did you speak the truth to Mr. Green?—Yes.

9172. Did you tell him Mr. Blunt had asked you to go and sign the deed?—Yes.

9173. And said it would oblige him to sign the deed?—Yes.

9174. And took you in a cab?—Yes.

9175. And that you saw persons at the railway office?—Yes.

9176. And that one of them had mentioned 75 shares to you?—Yes.

9177. Did you tell him you had signed the deed?—Yes.

9178. And that you had no shares?—Yes.

9179. And paid no deposit, and had nothing to do with the matter?—Yes.

9180. Did you tell him about Hurle?—Yes.

9181. That was before you had seen Mr. Bircham?—Yes.

9182. Did you then see Mr. Bircham?—Yes.

9183. Did you tell the same story to him?—Yes.

9184. Did he put it down in writing?—Yes.

9185. What do you mean by saying that Mr. Bircham told you to say this, that and the other?—I asked him what I should have to say, in case I should be examined.

9186. Was that after you had given in your statement?—Yes.

9187. What did he tell you?—He told me I should have to state the facts, what passed when I signed my name.

9188. Now, I ask you upon your word, did he not tell you to speak the truth when you came here?

Mr. *Phillips* objected to the question. Upon an intimation from the Committee, the question was waived.

Mr. George Harris. 27 April 1837.

9189. *Chairman.*] Did Mr. Bircham desire you to say anything but what you had previously told him; do you understand the question?—Yes.

9190. Did Mr. Bircham desire you to say anything but what you had previously told him relating to the transactions you had with Mr. Blunt at the railway office?—He told me nothing more than what I said, that I know of.

9191. Did he desire you to say anything that had not passed in reality with Mr. Blunt at the railway office?—No, he did not.

9192. What did you mean by the question you put to Mr. Bircham, when you asked him what evidence you were to give; what did you mean by that question?—I did not say, "What evidence am I to give?" I merely asked him what I should say, in case I was examined.

9193. What was the meaning of the question you put to him, when you asked him what evidence you were to give?—I asked him what I should have to say in regard to signing the bill.

9194. Did you mean to ask his advice whether you should say anything contrary to the truth?—No, I did not.

9195. Mr. *Hill.*] Did Mr. Bircham hold out any inducement to you, directly or indirectly, to say anything but the truth?—No.

9196. Or to keep back the truth?—No.

9197. Either at that time or any other?—No.

9198. Have you, directly or indirectly, had money from Mr. Bircham?—No.

9199. Have you a mother who possesses some property?—Yes.

9200. You have resided with her?—Yes.

9201. Has she supplied your wants since you have been out of place?—Yes.

9202. *Chairman.*] When you told us that Mr. Bircham informed you what you were to say, did Mr. Bircham tell you to say anything contrary to the truth, or to what you had previously told him?—No, he did not.

9203. Mr. *Hill.*] Did you ask Mr. Bircham what it was you would be asked about when you came here?—Yes.

9204. Did he tell you you would be asked about signing the deed?—Yes.

9205. And did Mr. Bircham tell you you would be asked at whose wish it was you signed the deed?—Yes.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Thomas Green*, called in; and Examined by Mr. *Hill*, as follows:

Mr. Thomas Green.

9206. DID you take the last witness, Harris, to Mr. Bircham's office?—I did.

9207. Had he given you a statement before you took him to Mr. Bircham?—He had.

9208. Tell us what he said to you?—I went up to his house, Aberdeen-place, Maida-hill, and I was introduced to him. I stated to him that his name appeared upon a deed, that deed being the City Railway deed, for a certain number of shares; I do not recollect the number; upon which he expressed his surprise. I then showed him a printed copy of the deed.

9209. Of the subscription list?—Yes, upon which his name appeared, I think, to the best of my recollection, for 5,000 *l.*

9210. Just look at a copy of the list [*The Witness looked at the list*]?—It is 3,500 *l.*

9211. You showed him the list?—I did. On looking at it he stated he could only account for it by having been a clerk to Mr. Blunt. I asked him who Mr. Blunt was; and he stated to me that he was the engineer belonging to the company, whose offices were in Fleet-street; he stated to me he had had a conversation with his employer, Mr. Blunt, relative to signing a deed, but he could not take upon himself to say it was the City Railway deed. I then asked him where he went to, and he stated that he went in a cab, accompanied by Mr. Blunt, to an office at a seed-shop, opposite the Mansion-house; that he was there introduced to some parties on the first floor of that house, when there was a discussion between them as to the number that he should sign for. The deed was produced to him; he signed his name; they then argued the point again as to the number that should be put against his name; and he stated to me that he believed the number was 75; that he never recollected putting the sum 3,500 *l.* against his name in that deed; he considered that Mr. Blunt had imposed upon him,

him, and if I would take him down to Mr. Bircham he would do everything that laid in his power for the purpose of setting the transaction right.

9212. You then did take him down?—I explained to him the serious responsibility upon the deed, and he stated a nobleman's name, I do not recollect now; that he was his guardian, and he trusted I would not let it come to his ears that he had committed so foolish an act as to sign an instrument, not knowing what that instrument contained. I then stated to him that if he would walk down with me to Mr. Bircham's, I would take him there and explain the circumstances to Mr. Bircham, he being the party opposing the line of railway, and in consequence he made an appointment for two o'clock that day, to meet me in Queen-street. I met him in Queen-street, and took him to Mr. Bircham's accordingly.

9213. Were you present when he made that statement to Mr. Bircham?—I was present when he made a statement to Mr. Bircham.

9214. Was the statement he had made to Mr. Bircham the same as he made to you?—Exactly the same in purport, though not in words.

9215. *Chairman.*] No material variation?—No.

9216. Mr. *Hill.*] Do you recollect his asking Mr. Bircham what he would be asked about in the Committee?—

Mr. *Phillips* objected to the question.
The question was waived.

9217. *Chairman.*] State all that passed?—I introduced Mr. Harris to Mr. Bircham as being the party I had called upon, and the party I had made an appointment with at two o'clock to meet him. Mr. Bircham then asked Harris whether he had been so foolish as to sign the deed according to the terms I stated to him; he stated that he knew nothing whatever of having incurred a responsibility to the amount I had stated, until I had called upon him that morning. Mr. Bircham asked him whether he would have any objection to come forward and state the facts before a Committee of the House of Commons. Mr. Harris stated he should have not the least objection to come and state all he knew relative to the transaction; that he considered he had been shamefully used; that he was only receiving 30*s.* a week from Mr. Blunt, and that Mr. Blunt had told him, in case the Bill was got, it would be all the better for him. He then stated that a fellow clerk of his, of the name of Hurle, who was an invalid, had signed the deed, never having paid upon any shares, and never had had any shares in his possession, at the office of Mr. Blunt. He was asked how he knew that circumstance; and he answered, by a person of the name of Gethen and Mr. Blunt bringing the deed of the City Railway, together, on the same day that he had signed the deed. When I say together, I mean to the office of Mr. Blunt. Mr. Blunt called out to Harris to know whether Hurle was there, and Harris answering yes, he was desired to send him to Mr. Blunt; he went to Mr. Blunt, and was closeted with him in his room for a quarter of an hour or 20 minutes, and when he came back he was curious, and asked him what he had been doing.

9218. Who do you mean by he?—Mr. Harris asked Mr. Hurle, his fellow clerk, when he stated he had been signing a deed; Mr. Harris asked him whether there was any responsibility in what he had been doing; Mr. Hurle stated he had done so several times, and it would be all the better for him. Then he stated at that interview that Mr. Hurle was a fellow clerk of his at the office of Mr. Blunt, receiving a salary of 2*l.* a week; and when asked by Mr. Bircham whether he considered he could have paid upon the shares, Mr. Harris stated, that from what he knew of the party he was satisfied he could not.

9219. Mr. Bircham asked Mr. Harris whether Mr. Hurle could pay?—Yes; and Mr. Harris said, from the knowledge he had of Mr. Hurle, certainly not. I believe Mr. Bircham asked Mr. Harris whether, if he required him, he was to be found at Aberdeen-place; he said yes, and there the conversation ended.

9220. Mr. *Hill.*] Did Mr. Bircham take down in writing what Mr. Harris told him?—He did.

9221. Was it read over to him?—Yes, it was.

9222. Do you know the paper?—I should know the writing again if I was to see it.

9223. Look at that [*handing a Paper to the Witness, marked E.*]; is that a memorandum of the conversation?—Yes.

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

27 April 1837.

9224. *Chairman.*] That is the memorandum of what was taken down at the time?—Yes.

9225. Mr. *Hill.*] Do you know a Mr. Jacob Nunez Castello, of 11, Beaumont-street, gentleman?—I know a person of that name that did reside there.

9226. Has that gentleman signed this deed?—By a copy of the deed I have seen he appears to have done so.

9227. How many times?—I think twice.

9228. Are you sure it is only twice?—If I had the deed here I could see.

9229. Let us have the deed.—

9230. Mr. *Phillips.*] Do you know Castello's handwriting?—Yes.

9231. Mr. *Hill.*] Who is this Jacob Nunez Castello?—He is a person who jobs on the Royal Exchange.

9232. What do you call jobbing on the Royal Exchange; is he what is called a share-hunter?—He is what is vulgarly called a share-hunter.

9233. Is he the gentleman who was a witness in the Deptford and Dover Subscription List?—It is the same.

[*The Deed was produced and shown to the Witness.*]

9234. Read the entry?—"J. N. Castello, 11, Beaumont-street, gentleman, 25 shares, 1,250*l.*"

9235. Now again there is another signature, near the end [*Another part of the Deed was shown to the Witness.*]?—This is his writing too.

9236. Read the entry?—"J. N. Castello, 11, Beaumont-street, Mile End, 30 shares, 1,500*l.*"

9237. Then there is, very early, "J. N. Castello, gentleman, 25 shares"?—I have read that.

9238. *Chairman.*] Towards the end there is another [*The Deed was again shown to the Witness*].—This is his handwriting; it is for 20 shares; the figures 1,000 I cannot speak to; I should say that the 1,000 is not his handwriting.

9239. By whom is that witnessed?—W. Gethen.

9240. Have you given the witnessing parties in the other instances?—No, it is Edward Beetham.

9241. Making together 75 shares?—Yes.

9242. Do you know whether that person is now living?—Yes.

9243. Where?—Cock-court, Jewin-street.

9244. Are those almshouses?—Yes, Mocatta's almshouses.

9245. Is he living as an almsman in those Mocatta's almshouses?—Yes, he is.

9246. I ask you, has he been for a very long time notoriously unable to pay anything like 3,750*l.*?—Ever since I have known him.

9247. How long is that?—About three years.

9248. He has been notoriously unable, to the public, to pay that sum?—I cannot say to the public, but to the people that mix with him.

9249. On the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

9250. He is well known there?—Yes.

9251. Is he able to pay 3,750 farthings?—I should say he was not able to pay 10*l.*

9252. Do you know how many other subscription lists he is in?—I have unfortunately left my papers at home I put it down in.

9253. William Bryan, Auction Mart; do you know him?—Yes.

9254. What is he?—He is a waiter to Mr. Baker, who keeps the Auction Mart tavern.

9255. Is he on the deed?—I believe he has signed the deed for 10 shares; I should rather see the deed.

9256. Do you know his handwriting?—No, I do not.

9257. You know there is such a person as William Bryan, Auction Mart, waiter?—Yes, he is a waiter there now, at this time.

9258. A common waiter?—Yes.

9259. Is he in a situation to pay 500*l.*?—He has only what he derives from his situation, that I know of.

9260. Do you know him?—Yes.

9261. Do you believe he is incapable of paying this money?—From my knowledge of him, I should say he is incapable; but it is only from seeing him there.

9262. Is his name upon any other deed?—I do not know.

9263. "Henry

9263. "Henry Gunson, 4, Adam's-court, Broad-street;" do you know that person?—Yes, I do; "Henry Gunson, 4, Adam's-court;" I cannot trace the figures 1,500 *l.* to be his. Mr. *Thomas Green.* 27 April 1837.

9264. What is the entry?—"Henry Gunson, 30 shares, 1,500*l.*" The figures do not appear to me to be his handwriting; one part is a running hand, and the rest appears to be an upright hand.

9265. You have found him three times?—Here is another on the deed, another "Henry Gunson, 4, Adam's-court, Broad-street, gentleman, 30 shares, 1,500*l.*, Edward Beetham;" and then another, "40 shares, 2,000*l.*, Edward Beetham."

9266. Now the third?—I have read that.

9267. Who is this man?—Henry Gunson is a man who has been in the habit, for the last 12 months, perhaps 18 months, of getting his living by writing letters for shares.

9268. Then he is a share-hunter?—Yes.

9269. Has he any other mode, to your knowledge, of getting his livelihood?—Not to my knowledge.

9270. Is he in notoriously indigent circumstances?—Undoubtedly; lately he was so, on the Royal Exchange, and the party he mixes among.

9271. Has any change taken place lately?—About three months ago he had a sum of money left him, about 100*l.*

9272. Do you know where he is now?—I know where he was three days ago.

9273. Where?—In Whitecross-street prison.

9274. Do you know what for; is it for debt?—I did not ask him; I believe it is so.

9275. Do you know William Baker, who helps the Auction Mart tavern?—Yes, I do.

9276. Had you any conversation with him about Gunson?—Yes, I had.

9277. Tell us what it was?—About a month ago I was going over, in company with a person of the name of Stephen——

Mr. *Phillips* objected to the question, and stated that Mr. Baker should be called.

The *Chairman* stated that Mr. Baker had better be called.

Mr. *Hill* stated that Mr. Baker was a party in the transaction, and that this witness was called to prove these facts.

[The Witness was directed to withdraw.

Mr. *Phillips* objected to the witness being examined upon the conversation between him and Mr. Baker, and also objected to Mr. Hill stating what the witness was about to prove.

Mr. *Hill* was heard in answer to the objection.

The Committee decided that the question might be put.

Mr. *Thomas Green*, called in; and further Examined by Mr. *Hill*, as follows:

9278. YOU say you know William Baker, who keeps the Auction Mart tavern; what did he say to you about Gunson?—I met him on Westminster Bridge, and there was a conversation ensued relative to the Deptford Railway and the City Railway: I asked him whether he had signed the deed. Mr. *Thomas Green.*

9279. *Chairman.*] What deed?—The City Railway. He stated he had never signed the deed; I asked him who he had got to sign for the shares that he had, (I knew he had shares before this conversation occurred,) and he stated that Gunson signed for part of them; and I believe he stated, I am not positive, that he gave him a bottle of wine upon so doing.

9280. Mr. *Hill.*] Do you know Francis Drake, of 107, Stamford-street, merchant?—I know Francis Drake, but I never knew him at 107, Stamford-street.

9281. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes, I do. [*the Deed was shown to the Witness*].—"Francis Drake, 107, Stamford-street, merchant; 100 shares, 5,000*l.*, Edward Beetham."

9282. Do you know that man's handwriting?—Yes.

9283. Did he live at 107, Stamford-street?—No.

9284. Is he a merchant?—No.

9285. What is he?—When I first knew him, which was about seven years ago, he

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

27 April 1837.

he was a person connected with several bakers' shops. The first I had to do with him was to attend an officer in making a caption, that was in arresting him, about two years ago. I had lost him till about a year ago. I met him on the Royal Exchange, and expressed my surprise at meeting him there. I have seen him on and off for the last two years, with the exception of about three months.

9286. What has he been doing there for the last year?—Jobbing in shares.

9287. A sharehunter?—Yes.

9288. Do you know whether he has taken the benefit of the Insolvent Debtors' Act?—I believe he has.

9289. How long ago?—To the best of my recollection, about eight years ago. I am speaking from recollection as to the time.

9290. Are you sure of the fact?—To my recollection he was either a bankrupt or took the benefit of the Insolvent Debtors' Act.

9291. Is he in indigent circumstances?—He is.

9292. Is he very poor?—Yes, he is.

9293. Do you know whether he is engaged in bill transactions?—He has been.

9294. What do you mean by bill transactions?—By endorsing, drawing and accepting bills of exchange.

9295. Accommodation bills?—Yes.

9296. What you call "kites"?—What are generally called "kites."

9297. Do you know where he is now?—The last time I saw him, which was last Saturday, he was in Whitecross-street prison.

9298. Had you any conversation with him about any other railway?—I had a conversation with him about the South Midland Railway.

9299. By him you mean Francis Drake?—Yes.

9300. You had a conversation with him on Saturday?—It did not occur on Saturday. I asked him if he had signed any other deeds; he said he had signed several; and he mentioned the South Midland particularly.

9301. Did he mention the South Eastern?—Yes, I think he did; all of which he intended to put into his schedule.

9302. That you understood to mean under the Insolvent Debtors' Act; you were speaking of that court, about his debts?—Yes, as to how he was to get out of the responsibility of the deeds; and he said he should put them in his schedule.

9303. Is there a person of the name of Gurney upon this deed; Richard Gurney?—Yes.

9304. Do you know anything about him?—No, I do not.

9305. Have you inquired for that gentleman?—Yes, I have.

9306. At 13, King-street, St. James's?—Yes; not only 13, but 14, and generally the houses in the street.

9307. You have tried to find him in that street?—Yes.

9308. Have you succeeded?—No.

9309. Could you trace him?—No; 13 was a shut-up house.

9310. When was it you went?—About a month ago; but I went several times.

9311. You made careful inquiries of persons in the street if they knew any such person?—Yes, I did.

9312. Did you hear anything of this person, Mr. Gurney, from Drake?—Yes.

9313. What did he tell you?—He told me he knew nothing of him at the present time, he had no transactions with him, and for the last year he had not seen him. He stated it was very likely I might get some information of him by applying to Mr. Bozon, a clerk to Mr. Hobler, in Walbrook; I accordingly went to Mr. Hobler's office.

9314. Is that all that Drake told you about him; did he tell you how he got his living, or what sort of a person he was?—He stated he believed him to belong to a gambling-house; and I asked him whether this Mr. Gurney was one of three parties who belonged to gambling-houses; that is a person of the name of Hamilton, a person of the name of Gurney, and a person somewhere up in the Regent's Park, Langley.

9315. Are they all upon the printed list?—Yes.

9316. Did he say he belonged to gambling transactions?—No; he avoided answering the question.

9317. Mr. *Forster.*] What did you understand by belonging to gambling-houses?—Persons in the habit of frequenting gambling-houses, and getting their bread by so doing.

9318. *Chairman.*] You do not mean keeping the houses, but frequenting them?—Frequenting them.

9319. Mr. *Hill.*] You went to Mr. Bozon?—I went to Mr. Hobler's office, and they told me that Mr. Bozon had set up for himself in some court in Broad-street.

5320. Did you find him?—Yes.

5321. What did he tell you?—He told me he had not seen Mr. Gurney for some considerable time.

9322. Did he tell you what he was?—He told me he had been his solicitor at some election at Tregony.

9323. Whether he was ruined or not?—Yes, he told me he had been ruined; he had occasion to arrest him some number of times, and he committed an assault upon Lord Gifford.

Mr. *Phillips* stated that it would be better to have the evidence of Mr. Bozon.

The *Chairman* acceded to the suggestion of Mr. Phillips.

Mr. *Hill* stated that he would call Mr. Bozon, in obedience to the wishes of the Committee.

9324. Do you know Joseph Heenan, 39, Princes-road, Kennington?—No, I do not.

9325. You do not know his handwriting?—No.

9326. Did you inquire at No. 39, Princes-road, Kennington?—Yes, I did.

9327. What sort of inquiry did you make?—I was unable to see him; from the information I collected, he was out of town.

9328. Did you find he lived there?—Yes, in furnished apartments in a house of the rent of about 16*l.* a year the whole house; they stated to me that they believed him to be a clerk in an office; the landlady keeping the house stated to me she so considered him. I asked her if she considered him a man of property; she said, so far as she knew, he was not.

9329. "No. 33, Joseph Levy"; do you know him?—Yes.

9330. Do you know his handwriting?—I do not.

9331. "63, Pleasant-place, West-square, Lambeth;" do you know the man?—Yes, I know the man, and I have attended at the house.

9332. He is down for 30 shares, 1,500*l.*; how long have you known him?—I have known him by sight in his business for the last four or five years.

9333. What is he?—He is a person in the habit of walking upon the Royal Exchange to get parties' bills discounted.

9334. What do you call him?—He called himself a bill discounter.

9335. What do you call him?—I call him a share-hunter.

9336. Is he very poor?—Yes, he is very poor.

9337. Do you know whether he is known upon other lists?—I have not examined.

9338. "No. 34, William Mayne, 20, Brunswick-parade, gentleman, 10 shares, 500*l.*;" what is he?—A clerk in the house of Macintosh & Company, in Bishops-gate-street.

9339. Is he a share-hunter?—Yes, he is a person that writes for the generality of shares that come out.

9340. Have you had any conversation with him upon this subject?—Yes.

9341. Tell me what he told you?—He told me he had paid the deposits on the shares, and sold them, and there the matter ended with him.

9342. Did he tell you as to his dealing in shares?—It was unnecessary to do that, because he knew that I knew it.

9343. Did you state about trafficking in shares, and the consequences of it?—Yes, I told him he would get into difficulties; he asked me to be particularly kind in my report of a person on this deed.

9344. What is his name?—A person in the Excise-office.

9345. What is his name?—I cannot find the name; and he stated why I was to be particular in making my report was, that the party at the Excise-office had signed the deed for a party under age, and therefore the responsibility would fall upon him, being a friend of his at the Excise-office.

 9346. What

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

27 April 1837.

9346. What is the name?—" Matthew Stretch, Excise-office, Broad-street, gentleman, 15 shares, 750*l.*"

9347. Mr. *Phillips.*] Do you know his handwriting?—No, I do not.

9348. Mr. *Hill.*] 37 is " Joseph Dandridge, 102, Wood-street, gentleman;" do you know him?—Yes, I do.

9349. Does his name appear upon the list twice?—It does.

9350. What page is the first time?—Page 1, " J. Dandridge, 80 shares, 4,000*l.*"

9351. Then he is again somewhere else?—Page 4, " Joseph Dandridge, 102, Wood-street, gentleman, 55 shares, 2,750*l.*"

9352. What does that make altogether?—One hundred and thirty-five shares, 6,750*l.*

9353. Do you know what this man is?—A barber.

9354. Where?—At the house mentioned, Wood-street.

9355. Is he an outside jobber?—Yes.

9356. A share-hunter?—Yes.

9357. In his outside dealings has been a defaulter?—Yes, several times. I believe he is a defaulter at the present moment.

9358. Has he been unable to pay his deficiencies?—Yes, several times.

9359. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes, I do.

9360. Is he very poor?—Yes.

9361. Have you got a letter of his?—I have not got a letter of his here; I was not aware it would come on to-day; I can produce it to-morrow.

9362. Is he an agent for Morison's Pills?—Yes, he is.

9363. As well as a barber?—Yes.

9364. " Gustavus Edward Beckers," do you know him?—Yes.

9365. Is he down for 60 shares?—Yes; 3,000*l.*

9366. Is he known to you?—Yes, he is.

9367. At the time he signed the deed what were his circumstances?—How long ago are you speaking of the deed being signed?

9368. He stands early on the deed, 9 or 10 months ago?—In very distressed circumstances he was.

9369. Is he so now?—I do not know; he has left London three or four months; I have seen his wife, and inquired of her; she says she is in a very distressed situation, and he was so also.

9370. What has been his way of life?—Attending at the Royal Exchange, and after the Royal Exchange hours, going down to gambling-houses.

9371. Attending the Exchange as an outside jobber?—Yes.

9372. Is he a very poor man?—Yes; several subscriptions were made for him; and a man of the name of Jackson raised a subscription for him to pay his coach-hire down to Bath, when he left London.

9373. Has he a wife and family?—Yes.

9374. Are they all in distressed circumstances?—Yes.

9375. How long have you known him?—About two years.

9376. During that time has he been in distressed circumstances?—Yes.

9377. " 59, Samuel Carr," do you know him?—Yes.

9378. And his handwriting?—Yes.

9379. " Upper Charles-street, Northampton-square, Middlesex?"—He does not reside there. (*The Deed is shown to the Witness.*) " Samuel Carr, Upper Charles-street, gentleman, 20 shares, 1,000*l.*," that is in his own handwriting, and witnessed by Edward Beetham. The next is, " Samuel Carr, Upper Charles-street, Northampton-square, Middlesex, gentleman, 40 shares, 2,000*l.*: Edward Beetham." I believe he appears again.

9380. What does it all come to?—One hundred and fifty shares, 7,500*l.*

9381. Do you know whether he signed other deeds?—Yes.

9382. What is he?—He is a person in the Rotunda; he was a member of the Stock Exchange, but his circumstances were so desperate, he was unable to pay the annual sum of 10*l.*, and he is not any longer a subscriber to that place.

9383. How long has he ceased to be a subscriber?—Two or three months.

9384. Is he very poor?—Yes, he is very poor.

9385. Was he a lodger in this house?—Yes, in Upper Charles-street, Northampton-square, he was a lodger.

9386. Is he there now?—No.

9387. Where

9387. Where is he to be met with?—No. 27, Half Moon-crescent, White Conduit-fields.

9388. Is he a share-hunter?—Yes; but not to so large an extent as the other parties I have named.

9389. You say he has signed other deeds?—Yes; there is one deed that has been called to my attention, Rennie's Brighton, which amounts to about 107,000*l.* or 108,000*l.*

9390. "John Morgan, 13, Yardley-street, Clerkenwell?"—Yes, I see it; 10 shares, 500*l.*

9391. Does he sign more than once?—I do not see the name of Morgan, but here is the name of Moggan, 13, Yardley-street, Clerkenwell, gentleman, 20 shares, 1,000*l.*

[*Upon reference to the Deed it appeared to be the same signature.*]

9392. What have you known about him?—I have known him for the last 18 months, and I have known him to be in very distressed circumstances within the last four months. About four months ago I was called upon, with others, to give my mite to a subscription, which subscription was for the purpose of burying his wife; he was so distressed he could not put her underground.

9393. Is he connected with a gambling-house?—He is a person that attends at billiard-tables.

9394. What do you call him?—I should call him a bonnet.

9395. What do you call a bonnet?—A person that goes into a gambling-house to entice others.

9396. As a decoy duck?—Yes.

9397. Is he a share-hunter?—Yes.

9398. And an outside dealer upon the Stock Exchange?—Yes, till within these four months; and I have lost sight of him since the death of his wife.

9399. Is he able to pay any subscriptions?—He has admitted to me in the last two or three days that he is unable to pay anything of the kind, and he is exceedingly poor.

9400. When did you see him?—This morning, and I saw him last Saturday.

9401. Is he here?—Yes. I called at his lodgings, 13, Yardley-street; he does not reside there; and the party stated in the shop, who I believe to be the landlord of the house, that if it was so many farthings, he would undertake to say that Morgan could not pay it.

9402. Now, 75, it stands here "Silous Crisp, 13, Ranelagh-street, Custom-house agent;" do you know that person?—Yes, I do.

9403. Do you know he lives at 35, Ranelagh-street?—No, I do not. (*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*) "Silous Crisp, 35, Ranelagh-street, Custom-house agent, 25 shares, 1,250*l.*; Edward Beetham."

9404. That is a man you know?—Yes.

9405. What do you know of him?—At this present time he is a clerk in the house of Wilcock and Anderson, St. Mary-Axe; but at the time of signing the deed he was out of a situation.

9406. Is he very poor?—His circumstances now are dependent upon his salary; but at the time he signed the deed he was hanging round the public-houses near the Royal Exchange, and I have occasionally lent him small sums of money and given him a pint of beer.

9407. At the time this deed was signed he was in a very indigent state?—Yes, supposing it signed 10 months ago.

9408. Do you know the salary he has?—I cannot tell.

9409. About what?—I should think about 25*s.*, if I was to speak from conjecture.

9410. What is a Custom-house agent; what sort of jobs do they do?—He is in the habit of going down to the Custom-house, and clearing ships.

9411. What sort of employment is it they do, to get 2*s.* 6*d.*?—At the time he signed himself a Custom-house agent, I considered at that time, and I had every reason to believe it to be the fact, he was in the habit of going down to the Custom-house for parties, and, knowing the practice of the Custom-house, they gave him 2*s.* 6*d.* or a crown, according to the work he did.

9412. What was the work he did?—I am not a proficient in that myself.

9413. Did he go down to show people the offices?—No, he did not do that; he went down to clear out things from the Custom-house.

 9414. But

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

27 April 1837.

9414. But he was in very indigent circumstances, and hanging about the public-houses?—Yes.

9415. "No. 58, John Edward Stokes, Hemsley-terrace, Hackney;" do you know him?—Yes.

9416. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes, I do.

9417. He signed the deed for 80 shares, 4,000*l.*?—Yes, he has [*The Deed was shown to the Witness*]; "John Edward Stokes, Hemsley-terrace, Hackney, broker, 80 shares, 4,000*l.*; Edward Beetham."

9418. Do you know whether he took the benefit of the Insolvent Act?—About 3 ½ years ago he did.

9419. What is he?—A stockbroker.

9420. Do you mean to say he is a member of the Stock Exchange?—He was at the time of signing this deed; but he has been declared a defaulter in the last two or three weeks, and he is no longer a member of the establishment.

9421. Do you happen to know whether he was the broker to this railway company?—He has stated to me, in a conversation I had with him, that he was the broker of the company.

9422. Tell us what he has told you about them?—He has told me that a gentleman of the name of Walker, who he believed to be the deputy chairman of this company, in consequence of a person of the name of Binns, the secretary to the company, coming to Mr. Stokes's office, and advising with him as to the best mode of getting shares at a premium ——

9423. At a premium, or to a premium?—To a premium; and from what Mr. Binns stated to Mr. Stokes, he was induced to go upon the Stock Exchange.

9424. Did he tell you what Mr. Binns did state to him?—He stated that Mr. Binns stated to him that the Southwark Bridge Company, and some other company, which name I do not recollect at present, would take 2,000 shares; he was induced to go upon the Stock Exchange and buy shares for time; the settling-day, being the time bargained, arrived, and Mr. Binns was unable to pay the difference between the price of them on the Stock Exchange, or to take the shares and pay for them; the consequence was, that the parties Mr. Stokes had bought these shares of, waited upon Mr. Stokes, and from what Mr. Stokes stated to them, they formed a deputation and went to the City Railway Company's offices; in consequence of that Mr. Walker went to the office of Mr. Stokes, and stated that Mr. Binns had acted for himself, and not for the company; and afterwards Mr. Beetham had an interview with Mr. Stokes, (whether at the office of the company or at Mr. Stokes's, I cannot state,) when Mr. Beetham stated, "Mr. Stokes, you should not have done this; you know you have done it for Mr. Binns;" upon which Mr. Stokes said, "Mr. Beetham, if I had not taken your word for the company's, in 1824 and 1825, where would you have been?" Afterwards, the deputy-chairman waited at the office of Mr. Stokes, and deposited a certain number of the company's shares at the market price, as part payment of the deficiency of Mr. Binns, for the money owing by Mr. Stokes, the money being owed by other parties.

9425. *Chairman.*] As a deposit of Mr. Binns's deficiency?—Yes; which left a balance owing to Stokes, for commission and so on, under 15*l.*

9426. Mr. *Hill.*] Did Stokes tell you whether he understood himself to be employed by the company or Mr. Binns?—From what I understand from Mr. Stokes, he was clearly employed by the company; he went further, and stated that Mr. Walker would not have come and deposited the shares with him, if that had not been the case; and from what took place in 1824 and 1825, he was satisfied that was the case.

9427. Do you know where Mr. Binns is now?—I only know from report.

9428. What is that report?—That he is in the King's Bench prison.

9429. What was he?—Secretary to the company.

9430. "William Cooke, 8, Capel-court, Strand;" do you know him?—Yes.

9431. Does he live there?—No.

9432. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes; "William Cooke, 8, Capel-court, Stock Exchange, gentleman, 20 shares, 1,000*l.*; Edward Beetham."

9433. He has signed three times?—Only twice, I believe.

9434. How much is it for the second time?—Sixty shares, 3,000*l.* [*A Deed was shown to the Witness.*] "William Cooke, 8, Capel-court, gentleman, 60 shares, 3,000*l.*; Francis Beetham."

9435. Who is this person?—He is an outside jobber on the Royal Exchange.

9436. Is

9436. Is he very poor?—Yes.

9437. Is he the father of Henry Cooke in Mr. Stokes's office?—Yes, he is.

9438. Mr. Stokes, the party just named?—Yes.

9439. Does he reside in Capel-court now?—No; nor did, to my knowledge.

9440. Is there any such place as Capel-court-street?—Not to my knowledge; I do not know.

9441. Has he any place in Capel-court at the Stock Exchange?—Not to my knowledge.

9442. Have you inquired at 8, Capel-court?—He is known by being in that court; I have inquired there, and he has his letters directed there.

9443. Has he any offices there?—No; his residence is at Keppel-road, Stoke Newington.

9444. You say he is very poor?—I do.

9445. Is there the word Strand in the deed?—No; it is S. E.; it is amistake.

9446. "William Algernon Lens Piercy," do you know him?—Yes, I do.

9447. "16, Elder-street, Norton Folgate;" do you know his handwriting?—I do; this is his handwriting: "William Algernon Lens Piercy, 16, Elder-street, Norton Folgate, gentleman, 45 shares, 2,250 *l.*; Edward Beetham." The next subscription by the same person, is 15, Elder-street, instead of 16.

9448. He has changed the number?—Yes.

9449. Has he changed his house?—No, he has not.

9450. What is he?—He is a clerk in some notary's office; I do not know where; he was originally a person that, in case you wanted to send a letter, or send any body on errands, in the last three or four years, you were in the habit of giving him 3 *d.* or 4 *d.*, or 1 *s.*

9451. That is what you call a porter?—Yes.

9452. At John Robson's office?—No; at the time I was speaking of, he was not there; afterwards he got into that office, at 8*s.* a week.

9453. What are his circumstances now?—Very poor, indeed.

9454. Do you know if he signed the South Midland Company's deed?—Yes.

9455. And the London and Brighton and Shoreham?—The South Midland Counties, "William Algernon Piercy, 15, Elder-street, Spital-square, gentleman, 30 shares, 1,500 *l.*;" London, Shoreham and Brighton, "William Algernon Piercy, 7, Capel-court, Bank, gentleman, 10 shares."

9456. Is that the same man?—Yes.

9457. Has he any office there?—No; his letters are left similar to Cooke's; No. 7 is the place where Mr. Robson carries on his business. "Ditto, by the authority of Mr. John Frank, William Algernon Piercy, 15, Elder-street, Spital-square, two shares, 100 *l.*;" the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway, "William Algernon Piercy, 15, Elder-street, Spitalfields, five shares, 250 *l.*;" the same company a second time, "William Piercy, 7, Capel-court, gentleman, 15 shares, 750 *l.*;" the Eastern Counties Railway he has signed several times; the South Eastern he signed in a fictitious name.

9458. *Chairman.*] How do you know that?—He had a letter with 10 shares in the South Eastern Company, and the name was, "V. Gerald, 15, Elder-street;" he then sold this letter to a person of the name of Williams, on the Stock Exchange.

9459. Mr. *Hill.*] He stated this to you?—Yes; I saw the letter; and Mr. Williams having purchased it, and required him to sign the deed, or get the party to sign the deed to whom the letter belonged, and deliver in the scrip, he went to the offices of the South Eastern Company in Coleman-street, and being known there, they would not allow him to sign the deed; he afterwards went down to the office of Messrs. Clutton & Fearon, and not being known there, he signed the deed, and he stated to me that he had done it.

9460. *Chairman.*] In what name did he say he had signed it?—V. Gerald.

9461. What was the number of shares?—Ten shares.

9462. Fifty pounds shares?—I cannot say the amount; it was only in a letter.

9463. Mr. *Hill.*] This he told you himself?—Yes.

9464. That is the South Eastern?—Yes, the South Eastern and Brighton Railway.

9465. Is he in almost every share list in London?—In every list I have met with yet I have seen his name.

9466. What are the means of William Algernon Lens Piercy to meet these engagements?—I can only know his means by his mode of life, and what he has admitted to me; and the shares he has paid up upon, he has told me, after keeping

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

27 April 1837.

ing them a little while, he has been obliged to put them in pawn. There are on the Royal Exchange what are called walking pawnbrokers, who, if a person has paid 20*l.*, they will advance 5*l.* upon them, subject to their being redeemed by a certain time, or else to sell them.

9467. Is he a share-hunter?—Yes, he is.

9468. How long has he been known; is he known to all persons who know share-hunters?—All persons who know him in business, know him as a share-hunter.

9469. All persons who know the share-hunting interest, know him to be one?—Yes.

9470. Is this the gentleman that signed the petition which the Chairman just read, talking of his indignation at the charges against him?—Yes, he is the same person.

9471. "Robert Blackman, Bonner's-hall, Hackney, gentleman"?—I do not know such a name.

9472. Look to that handwriting [*the Deed was shown to the Witness*]?—I should say it was Blackmore; that is Mr. Blackmore's handwriting; and it is the mode in which he signs his name.

9473. Read the entry?—"R. Blackmore, Bonner's-hall, Hackney, gentleman, 35 shares, 1,750*l.*; Edward Beetham."

9474. You know that man, do you?—Yes, I do.

9475. You know his handwriting?—Yes.

9476. And the handwriting belongs to a man of the name of Blackmore?—Yes.

9477. He lives at Bonner's-hall, Hackney?—I do not know that he lives there.

9478. You know the man to whom that handwriting belongs?—Yes, I do.

9479. What is he?—A jobber outside of the Exchange.

9480. Is he a penny jobber?—Yes.

9481. What is the meaning of that?—That immediately a company is advertised in the newspapers, stating that applications for shares will be received by such and such persons, parties immediately write for a number of shares; and he is one of them; and when these letters come out, it depends upon the system that is hit upon by the parties bringing them out—some parties of the company.

9482. What does that mean?—They go and give for a share, where there is 2*l.* deposit paid, the parties will buy them back at 3*l.*

9483. The parties bringing out the company?—Yes; parties are induced to sell property they do not enjoy, and they are caught; what you call bears.

9484. Rigging a company is giving a false value to the shares by the parties connected with the company buying them at a higher price?—Yes; the others are where the parties leave them to their own merits.

9485. Does Blackmore rig the company?—No; he is one that depends upon the other parties rigging the company.

9486. He is the riggee, not the rigger?—Yes.

9487. A penny share-jobber?—Yes.

9488. Where is he to be found?—At the Edinburgh Castle public-house.

9489. Hanging about the public-houses?—Yes, during the Exchange hours, or at Capel-court, and round those places.

9490. Is he a man in indigent circumstances, unable to pay the sums for which he has signed?—He is not able to pay anything like it.

9491. "Peter Mudie, 29, Vaughan-terrace, City-road;" do you know his handwriting?—Yes.—[*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*]—"Peter Mudie, 29, Vaughan-terrace, City-road, gentleman, 35 shares; 1,750*l.* Edward Beetham."

9492. What is his occupation in life?—He has no particular mode; he draws up prospectuses, supposing a person wanted to bring out a company, and for that he will get paid; and he will write letters for shares.

9493. Is he a share-hunter?—Yes, but not to so large an extent as the other parties.

9494. He is not in so large a way of business?—No.

9495. Is he in indigent circumstances?—I have known him for two years, and I have known him, during that time, kicked out of a public-house because he could not pay his score.

9496. From that circumstance, you believe him to be in indigent circumstances?—Yes.

9497. "John Dickinson;" do you know his handwriting?—No.

9498. "No. 18, Addle-street, Aldermanbury;" what do you know of him?—I knew him as a man on the Royal Exchange; I called upon him at his house, and Mr. Stephen conversed with him; I saw him, but did not speak to him.

9499. You

9499. You have known him on the Royal Exchange?—Yes.

9500. Is he a penny dealer?—A man that will deal from a penny to 5*s.*

9501. Is he a lodger at the house?—Yes.

9502. Is he very poor?—Not so poor as the other parties I have stated.

9503. Is he in poor circumstances?—Yes.

9504. Has he been in insolvent circumstances?—I do not know.

9505. Or a bankrupt?—I have heard he has been a bankrupt.

9506. Does he live in the second floor?—Yes.

9507. Has he a family?—Yes.

9508. Can you judge whether he is in indigent circumstances?—I meet him at the Edinburgh public-house, where he smokes his pipe if he has nothing to do; and if he has he is on 'Change.

9509. Is he good for 500*l.*?—No.

9510. Nor anything like it?—No.

9511. "John Jackson," do you know his writing—[*showing the Deed to the Witness*]?—Yes, I do; this is his writing: "14, Dorset-crescent, New North-road, gentleman; 100 shares, 5,000*l.* Edward Beetham."

9512. How long have you known him?—Two years and a half or three years.

9513. During that time what have been his circumstances?—During the whole time I have known him his circumstances have been extremely poor.

9514. Do you think he could raise 20*l.* at any time?—I should say he could not raise 20*s.*

9515. At any time in the two years?—At one time he might have raised 20*l.*

9516. Is that the extent?—No; he might have been able to raise more than that at one time. He had been successful in shares, and the money he succeeded in gaining he very soon after lost.

9517. Was he at any time good for anything approaching to 5,000*l.*?—No, not during the time I have known him, nor for 500*l.*

9518. What is his calling?—He is a person on the Royal Exchange who had principals, bankers' clerks and others, who are in the habit of speculating, and they employ him in preference to employing a broker, because he does the business so much cheaper by commission; where others would charge 1*s.* 3*d.*, he would do it for 3*d.*

9519. What is he?—He calls himself a gentleman.

9520. What do other people call him?—A share-jobber.

9521. Did he sign the South Midland deed?—South Midland Counties; "John Jackson, 14, Dorset-crescent; 310 shares, 15,500*l.*" The Westminster Bridge and Deptford; "John Jackson, 14, Dorset-place, New North-road, gentleman; 10 shares, 500*l.*" The same deed the second time; "John Jackson, 14, Dorset-crescent; 50 shares, 2,500*l.*"

9522. Has he ever been a man at all responsible for a hundredth part of this sum?—Since I have known him, and the conversation I have had with him regarding his means of living and the property he has been in possession of, I should think he was never in possession of 100*l.* He has stated to me he has had his furniture taken from him several times, and he will not give them the means of doing it again; he will live in furnished apartments.

9523. Charles Fraser, 94; 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road; do you know him?—Yes.

9524. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes, I do. (*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*)—"Charles Fraser, 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road, share-agent, 10 shares, 500*l.*; Edward Beetham."

9525. *Chairman.*] There is another entry of the same person—[*The Deed was handed to the Witness*]?—"Charles Fraser, 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road, share-agent, 20 shares, 1,000*l.*; Edward Beetham."

9526. Mr. *Foster.*] You stated, with regard to Drake and Carr, that they did not reside at the places opposite their names; do you know whether they did at any time during the last year?—Samuel Carr did reside, in my opinion, at the house at the time the deed was signed, but Drake never lived at the house 107, Stamford-street.

9527. Drake's you consider altogether a fictitious residence?—Yes, I do.

[*For Questions* 9528 *to* 9847, *inclusive, see Report on the Westminster Bridge, Deptford and Greenwich Railway.*]

Veneris, 28° die Aprilis, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Thomas Green*, called in; and further Examined, as follows:

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

28 April 1837.

9848. Mr. *Bircham.*] "Robert Wood;" do you know him?—Yes.

9849. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes, I do. [*The Deed was shown to the Witness*]. "Robert Wood, 18, Albion-place, Walworth, agent; 10 shares, 500*l.* Edward Beetham."

9850. What is his occupation?—He is a jobber on the Royal Exchange and Capel-court.

9851. Are his means equal to his subscription on that deed?—Certainly not.

9852. Is he a member of the Stock Exchange?—Certainly not.

9853. Does he job on a large scale?—He jobs in anything; in penny shares, and twopenny shares, and in Spanish, according to his circumstances.

9854. Do you mean that he is notoriously unequal to pay the amount of his shares?—I have occasionally lent him 1*s.*, or 6*d.*, or 1*s.* 6*d.*, and he is notoriously acknowledged to be poor.

9855. "John Vaugton" [*the Deed was shown to the Witness*]; you know his writing?—This is his writing.

9856. Is the whole writing his handwriting?—Yes. "48, Prospect-place, St. George's-road, Southwark, agent; 20 shares, 1,000*l.* Edward Beetham."

9857. What is he?—I believe at the present time he is nothing in particular. I have known him eight years; he was a coal-merchant residing over the water, and he was at that time a bankrupt. I had occasion at that time to go up and inquire into his respectability; he had removed to a house in St. George's-road, No. 61. Then I was referred to St. George's-road, to a hairdresser's shop, where I found him to reside. He was not at home when I went to make the inquiry. I had an interview with his wife, a person who stated she was his wife, who stated, if Mr. Vaugton had not been one man out of a hundred, on account of his unfortunate circumstances, he never would have been able to bear up under it, and stated, on account of her illness, they had been in very great distress; but she hoped, in the course of a week or a fortnight, he would get into a better situation of life, and they should be better off.

9858. Had you known Vaugton before this?—I had known him eight years.

9859. Have you known him as a dealer in shares?—I knew him as a clerk in the London Grand Junction Railway; he was discharged from that company, and then came upon the Exchange as a jobber.

9860. Can you state he is very poor, and unable to pay these sums?—I should say he was unable to pay 100 pence, much more 1,000*l.*, from the knowledge I have of him.

9861. The next name is Thomas Christopher Meason?—I do not know his handwriting.

9862. What do you know of him?—Meason I have known for the last two or three years as a jobber in Capel-court and on the Royal Exchange.

9863. He is not a member of the Stock Exchange?—No, not since I have been acquainted with him.

9864. Do you know enough of him to know he was quite unable to pay 1,000*l.*?—If I can arrive at that conclusion, that there are different parties on the Royal Exchange who he is defaulter to for small sums of money; a person of the name of Gray for 28*l.*, and which he agreed to pay at so much a month, and which have not been paid according to the terms of the agreement; and he has frequently been a defaulter on the Royal Exchange.

9865. How lately do you speak of that he has been a defaulter?—About three months ago.

9866. And the last time before that?—The circumstance not being of importance, and occurring very frequently, I could not exactly state the time; I should say within a year.

9867. "William Bloxam." I think you know him; he describes himself "of Merton

Merton Cottage, Surrey, stockbroker;" do you know him?—Yes, I do. [*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*] "William Bloxam, of Merton Cottage, stockbroker," is in his handwriting, but "Thirty-five" and "1,750*l.*" I cannot distinguish, on account of an erasure; "William Beetham" is the witness; the initials are his, I think.

9868-9. "William Burnett"?—"W. Burnett" is the handwriting of "Mr. Bloxam, Park-street, gentleman; 15 shares, 750*l.*"

9870. I understand you to say that the name of "William Bloxam, Merton Cottage, stockbroker, 35 shares, 1,750*l.*," and "William Burnett, Park-street, gentleman, 15 shares, 750*l.*," are both the handwriting of Mr. Bloxam?—Yes, to the best of my belief they are; I should say, from my knowledge of his handwriting, "W. Burnett" is in the handwriting of Mr. Bloxam.

9871. Have you had frequent opportunities of seeing him write?—Yes, I have seen him write 100 times.

9872. Have you heard him state the fact?—I have heard him state frequently he has been in the habit of writing in the name of Burnett and William Burnett, Bloxam and William Bloxam; it is a common thing on the Royal Exchange; persons in the habit of writing for shares are in the habit of writing in different names.

9873. To get the shares allotted as for different parties?—Yes.

9874. To prevent it being noticed?—Yes; and to get as many shares as they can, in case they should be of any value. Mr. Bloxam has stated, "Why should he not use the name of Burnett; his uncle's name is Burnett, and his name is Burnett; he has as much right to use the one as the other:" his real name is William Burnett Bloxam, I understand.

9875. Do you know whether this party is in the habit of getting other parties to write for him?—Yes.

9876. Is he very choice in the selection of them?—I have heard him state, and it has been in the company of many persons, that he would get all the women that walked down the New-road, and all the butlers and servants round the squares to write for these shares, stating that the whole system was founded in robbery.

9877. What do you mean by stating "the butlers round the squares?"—The direction of the letters being extremely good, it was likely shares would be appropriated to them.

9878. How does he get them?—By going to them and paying them a sum of money; if they were worth 5*l.*, and he paid them 10*s.*, they would be satisfied.

9879. Is Bloxam on the Stock Exchange?—No, not now.

9880. Was he?—Yes.

9881. Why has he left?—It is reported he has been a defaulter.

9882. Do you know him notoriously as a penny dealer?—Yes; I have dealt with him myself repeatedly.

9883. What should you say Bloxam's occupation is now?—I cannot state the fact, as I have not seen him in the last two or three months; but the last time I saw him was at his house in Park-street; at that time he was not in the habit of coming to the Royal Exchange, because there was nothing to be earned.

9884. "William Hamilton" is the next name?—I could not take upon me to prove his handwriting, though I have seen him write.

9885. *Chairman.*] Do you know a person of the name of William Hamilton?—Yes.

9886. Mr. *Bircham.*] Do you know him living at Lambeth, or, in fact, living at 15, George-street, Lambeth?—William Hamilton?

9887. *Chairman.*] Do you know a man of the name of William Hamilton, who lives at 15, George-street, Lambeth?—I do.

9888. Mr. *Clarkson.*] What paper is that you are reading from?—It is a memorandum I made of the party.

9889. When did you make it?—A month ago.

9890. Upon what occasion?—After I had been to see the party.

9891. Upon the occasion of your going to the place?—Yes; the same I did as to them all.

9892. *Chairman.*] State what you know of him?—I have got down "William Hamilton, Lambeth, 80; this person's direction ought to be, 15, George-street, Lambeth; states he signed the deed."

9893. He stated that to you?—Yes.

9894. And for that amount?—Yes.

9895. Mr. *Bircham.*] Do you know his occupation?—Yes, I do.

9896. Do

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

28 April 1837.

9896. Do you know him to be a subscriber to other railways?—I do.

9897. Do you know whether he has signed the same description?—"The South Midland Railway, William Hamilton, 15, George-street, Lambeth, 100 shares, 5,000*l.*"

9898. Have you found him by any other description?—Yes.

9899. Mr. *Clarkson.*] How do you know it is the same person?—I have had occasion to see him upon other companies, and he has stated to me it is the fact; "The London, Shoreham and Brighton, William Hamilton, 56, Quadrant, coal-merchant, 10, shares, 1,000*l.*"

9900. Mr. *Bircham.*] Do you know what that house is?—I have never been in the house; I have been given to understand it is a gambling-house.

9901. Do you know his occupation?—He has stated to me about a fortnight or three weeks ago, when I met him and went to a public-house, he stated, says he, "You have found me out; I suppose I shall be examined, and as you have found me in the Quadrant, you had better state to the parties I have a share in it;" but I have every reason to believe he is a person that goes into gambling-houses to decoy others.

9902. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You did not go into that gambling-house?—No, not into it; but he stated to me it was a gambling-house.

9903. Mr. *Bircham.*] Is he a dealer in shares?—Yes, he is.

9904. And writes for them commonly?—Not so common as other parties I have mentioned.

9905. *Chairman.*] Where does he ply in his business of purchasing shares?—The Auction Mart Tavern and the Edinburgh Castle.

9906. Mr. *Bircham.*] "Charles Lochington," do you know him?—I do.

9907. Do you know him well?—Yes, by meeting him on the Royal Exchange.

9908. He describes himself as a stock and share broker; is that a true description?—He was never a stockbroker, to my knowledge.

9909. *Chairman.*] What is he?—A person that comes upon the Royal Exchange if he gets any shares, and sells them occasionally if it is worth his while.

9910. Mr. *Bircham.*] What should you call him?—A jobber in penny shares I should call him.

9911. Are his means equal to a subscription of this kind?—What is the amount?

9912. Five hundred pounds?—I should say no.

9913. "William Robinson Chamberlain," in the middle of the seventh page, do you know him?—Yes, I do.

9914. And his handwriting?—Yes.

9915. What is his profession?—Chamberlain is a kind of share-broker, unattached to the Stock Exchange, on the Royal Exchange; he is in the habit of going to banking-houses, merchants' counting-houses, and to other places where there are clerks of respectability and of a speculating description, previous to the hours of the principals coming, namely about nine o'clock; then he has engagements to perform for them, buying shares and selling shares for them, and giving for the puts and calls upon Spanish, or in the funds generally.

9916. Is this the same gentleman who procured parties to sign the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway deed?—Yes.

9917. "William Dorrington," do you know him?—Yes, I do.

9918. He is described as of the "Auction Mart coffee-house;" is that his place of abode?—No.

9919. Where is it?—No. 9, Harleyford-place, Kennington Common.

9920. What is he?—An agent for the sale of shares, and also a letter writer.

9921. Is he a person equal to a subscription of 3,000*l.*?—Certainly not.

9922. Do you know whether he has signed any other deeds?—Yes.

9923. What other deeds?—The London, Shoreham and Brighton.

9924. Do you know for how many shares?—"William Dorrington, Kennington, broker, 10 shares, 1,000*l.*"

9925. Any other?—The South Midland Counties Railway, "William Dorrington, 9, Harleyford-street, Kennington, agent, 220 shares, 11,000*l.*;" Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway, "William Dorrington, Harleyford-street, agent, 10 shares, 500 *l.*;" Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway, "William Dorrington, Kennington Common, gentleman, 50 shares, 2,500*l.*"

9926. How long have you known Dorrington?—The last two or three years.

9927. Do you know whether he has ever taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act?—I do not know.

9928. Do you consider Dorrington equal to the amount of 3,000 *l.* upon this deed?—As far as my opinion of him goes, I do not think he is able to fulfil a contract where 60 *l.* is required.

9929. *Chairman.*] Independent of that opinion, do you know any circumstances from which you are led to form that opinion?—By continually meeting with him at the Royal Exchange, and different public-houses round, I am judging of the ability of the man to pay a large sum of money; this man is very frequently distressed for the sum of 2*s.* or 3*s.*; and if there is a sum of money like 60 *l.* owing, I am satisfied, in my opinion, he could not pay it.

9930. You have had frequent conversations with him?—Yes, continually.

9931. You have stated, in your former answer, he is often distressed for the sum of a few shillings; do you know that of your own knowledge?—Yes, I do, of my own knowledge.

9932. Mr. *Bircham.*] "William Constantine;" do you know him?—Yes, I do.

9933. Do you know that he resides at 18, John-street, Holloway?—Yes.

9934. What is he?—A tailor.

9935. Does he get his living by that entirely?—He is a tailor by business, and in the habit of writing for shares.

9936. Where have you seen him?—I have seen him in different public-houses, playing Richard the Third; I have seen him dining at different public-houses; I have also seen him at work upon the stairs of the Auction Mart public-house for the cabmen, and at the Edinburgh Castle.

9937. *Chairman.*] Do you mean in the tailor's business?—Yes, in both characters.

9938. Mr. *Bircham.*] Do you know that his circumstances are humble?—Yes, I know his circumstances are very poor.

9939. Have you any reason, further than your general knowledge of him, for stating his poverty?—Nothing.

9940. "James Macarthy, 18, Beaumont-square, wine-merchant;" do you know him?—Yes, I do.

9941. What is his occupation?—A writer for shares, and a person who attends upon the Royal Exchange.

9942. What are his circumstances?—His circumstances, as he stated to me frequently, he has been in very distressed circumstances, and required occasionally the loan of small sums of money.

9943. From you?—Yes; he has also been in the habit of pawning his letters for the grog he has been drinking, not having the money to pay for it.

9944. Do you know where he is resident now?—No, I do not.

9945. Have you inquired after him at 18, Beaumont-square?—Yes; I cannot find him out.

9946. He is not living there now?—No.

9947. Have you heard anything of him there?—No; the house was shut up at the time; I have since met him in the street, and he told me he wrote to the company for shares, and the company did not think proper to send him any; and he signed the deed, but the shares belonged to another person; he would not tell me who; that it would be time enough to tell the Committee.

9948. Do you know his circumstances?—They are extremely distressed.

9949. Do you know whether he formerly lived in Crutched Friars?—No, I do not.

Mr. *Bircham* stated he was now about to proceed to a class of persons of whom the witness had no personal knowledge; but of whom he had inquired, according to their residences given in the deed.

Mr. *Clarkson* suggested whether it would not be more consistent with justice, and the regularity of the proceedings of the Committee, that the allegations of the Petition should be in the first place inquired into; that there was a class of persons alluded to in the Petition, who had been procured to sign the deed for small sums of money, which it would be desirable, if it could be done, to bring home to the knowledge of the directors or officers of the company?

The *Chairman* stated that the allegations in the Petition were of the most general description; and if it appeared that the aggregate of subscriptions by men of no substance was sufficient to reduce the sum subscribed below the

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

28 April 1837.

the 50 per cent. required by the Standing Orders, it was a material fact to lay before The House for its information.

9950. Mr. *Bircham.*] "Henry Collinson" on the first page; do you see his description on the deed?—I see it on this paper which appears on the deed.

9951. You find his address there to be?—"No. 17, Bedford-place, Russell-square."

9952. Have you inquired at Bedford-place?—I have inquired three or four times both at Upper Bedford-place and 17 Bedford-place, and traced a gentleman of that name; I think his name was Henry Brown Collinson, 2, Guildford-street, but he was not the party; I have been also to the Commercial-road, to Russell-place or Russell-street; the answer I received at 17, Bedford-place, Russell-square, was, that no such person resided there.

9952*. Nor was known there?—Nor was known there.

9953. Have you found Mr. Collinson's name attached to other deeds?—I have found the name Henry Collinson, 17, Bedford-place, Russell-square, attached to the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway, "10 shares, 500 *l.*" The Chester and Crewe Railway, "17, Bedford-place, Russell-square, 10 shares, 500 *l.*"

9954. "Robert Brine," on the sixth page, four from the bottom?—"Camden-hill Villa, Kensington, wine-merchant."

9955. Have you inquired there after him?—Yes.

9956. Did you find him there?—No.

9957. What did you hear of him?—That he had moved to Dobson's-terrace, Kennington.

9958. Did you follow him there?—Yes.

9959. What did you find there?—That he had run away, but I could not find where he had gone.

9960. How do you mean run away?—Run away by night from his lodgings, from his house, and had left several debts, and among others, a person of the name of Woolfe, a baker, 14 *s.*

9961. "Thomas Ford, Retreat-place, Hackney," in page 2, half-way down, do you know his writing?—Yes. [*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*] This is his writing, "Thomas Ford, Retreat-place, Hackney, gentleman, 10, 500 *l.*; Edward Beetham."

9962. You know him?—I do.

9963. Will you state to the Committee his circumstances?—This person has removed from Retreat-place, Hackney, to Highgate.

9964. What do you know of him?—I know at this present time he is out of the way on account of his difficulties; two months ago an execution was put into his house.

9965. "Joseph Amanio," page 4?—118, St. John-street-road.

9966. What description is he?—An optician.

9967. Is he a resident optician?—He is living with his father at 118, St. John-street-road.

9968. Have you met him?—Yes; the father I have met at the Edinburgh Castle.

9969. Have you met the son?—Yes, occasionally; very seldom.

9970. Is he in business for himself?—No, he told me he was not; that the shop was his father's and everything in it, and if he had incurred any responsibility by signing the deed, he was very sorry for it, and that none of the property belonged to him, and that he could not pay the money.

9971. Does his signature appear to other deeds?—To the South Midland, the same address, "30 shares, 1,500 *l.*"

9972. Thomas Arnold?—Denmark-street, grocer.

9973. Have you gone to the place described here?—Yes, I did.

9974. Did you find Arnold residing there?—I did.

9975. What kind of a house is it?—A general chandler's-shop, one door before you come to the street that leads into the Seven Dials.

9976. Was Arnold occupying the house?—No, he resides on the second floor; the house is let out in separate apartments, and the party stated to me, who keeps the shop, that he lodges on the second floor.

9977. What should you say would be the rent of a room in that house?—From the knowledge I have of lodgings I have lived in, I should say 4 *s.* a week.

9978. Does he carry on any business there?—I cannot state he carries on any business; I have never been up in the room, I have seen him at the door. I asked

in

in the shop if he had been a grocer: they said he might have been a grocer; what he was now, they did not know.

9979. *Chairman.*] Who told you this?—The person who keeps the shop in the house where he resides.

9980. Did you see the man himself?—I did. I called upon him and stated his name appeared upon the deed for 30 shares, and asked him whether he held the shares, whether he paid the deposit, and whether he signed the deed; he stated to me he held the shares, and that he signed the deed.

9981. Mr. *Clarkson.*] What did he say about the deposit? you have not mentioned that?—That he paid the deposits.

9982. Mr. *Bircham.*] "Edward Brenan;" third page; did you inquire at 41, High Holborn, as to Brenan?—Yes.

9983. Did you find him there?—No.

9984. What did you hear of him?—It is a coffee-shop nearly opposite to Chancery-lane; they stated, he had been in the habit of taking his coffee there and of having his letters directed there.

9985. Have you found Brenan described in any other place?—I have found a Brenan of Gibraltar-place or road, Bethnal-green.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated there should be some proof that it was the same person.

9986. *Chairman.*] Does he appear under the same address?—No, he does not.

9987. Do you find a person bearing the same name upon the deed?—Certainly.

9988. Mr. *Bircham.*] Did you hear anything of Brenan's circumstances?—I know nothing of them.

9989. "Charles Gould, 67, King-street, Golden-square," on the eighth page, did you inquire at that place?—Yes, I inquired there.

9990. Did you find Gould residing there?—It is a milk-shop, and they said they had lived there 12 years, and they never knew any such person living there.

9991. "Charles Manby?"—"No. 1, Salisbury-street, gentleman."

9992. Did you inquire after this person?—Yes, I did, and the answer was, that this person had not resided there for the last six years; it is a lodging-house.

9993. Do they know anything of him now?—They said he was occasionally to be seen at the Bank; but they know nothing whatever of him.

9994. "Thomas Rose, 38, Newgate-street," on the third page; did you inquire at Newgate-street for this person?—Yes.

9995. Did you find him at 38?—It is a stationer's shop; he was clerk there, and they stated to me he had gone to Scotland or to America, I do not know which.

9996. They did not know where he was?—No; they stated precisely the place, but I do not know which it was.

9997. "James Railton, 2, Queen-street, Islington;" did you call there?—Yes; he is living with his mother, who keeps a chandler's shop, Jane Railton.

9998. What is the rent of the house?—Being very near me, I can judge of the rent; I should say about 20 *l.* a year.

9999. Jane Railton keeps the shop?—Yes, and James Railton signs the deed.

10000. Does he sign other deeds?—Yes; I find a person of that name and description on the South Midland, "2, Queen-street, Islington, gentleman; 50 shares, 2,500 *l.*" London, Shoreham and Brighton, "James Railton, 2, Queen-street, Islington; five shares, 500 *l.*" The same company, "for William Railton, James Railton, 8, Portland-place, Walworth; three shares, 300 *l.*"

10001. He is a lodger there?—Yes.

10002. "John Reid, 20, Baker-street, Pentonville;" did you inquire there after this person?—Yes.

10003. Did you find him there?—I did not.

10004. Could they tell you where he was?—No, they could not tell me; he was gone away, and they did not know where; they believed him to be a clerk in the city.

10005. Do you find a person of the same description signing other deeds?—The South Midland Counties, "John Reid, 20, Baker-street, gentleman; 100 shares, 5,000 *l.*"

 10006. "George

Mr. Thomas Green.

28 April 1837.

10006. "George Wilson, 131, Chancery-lane," in the seventh page, the last name but one; did you inquire there after this person?—Yes, I did.

10007. Did you find him there?—I did not; the party who kept the house stated he had resided there six months; he ran away the 24th of December last, and never paid any rent, and that he took the benefit of the Insolvent Act about three years ago; and the party stated he should be very happy to come here and state anything he knew about him.

10008. "Henry Cooper, 8, St. Thomas's-street, Borough," in the third page; did you inquire at that place for Henry Cooper?—There are two numbers 8, at both of which I called; I did not find him there; I found out where he lodged; he was a lodger there, and had left No. 8 about twelve months, but where he was gone the landlord did not know.

10009. Do you find a person of the same description on other deeds?—The Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway: "Henry Cooper, 8, St. Thomas's-street, Southwark, 10 shares, 500*l.*"

10010. "Charles Griffiths, 9, Myrtle-street, Hoxton;" did you inquire after him there?—Yes, I did; this person resided here, but has removed away; the parties in the house stated they did not know where.

10011. *Chairman.*] Was he lodger there?—Yes; the party keeping the house is a Mr. Griffith, but in no way acquainted, as stated to me.

10012. By whom?—By the person who opened the door.

10013. Mr. *Bircham.*] Do you find a person of the same description on other deeds?—South Midland Railway: "Charles Griffith, 9, Myrtle-street, Hoxton, 60 shares, 3,000*l.*".

10014. "John Jeremy;" did you inquire at the place described?—I applied at 26, Bucklersbury, to see Jeremy; I found a bill, stating that "letters and parcels for Mr. Jeremy are to be taken to 27, Falcon-square;" I attended at Falcon-square, No. 27, and I was given to understand that letters and parcels were left for him, and he sent a porter for them; but they do not know where he is to be found; he does not come himself.

10015. "John Henry Martin, 23, King-street, Long Acre," page 2?—I have applied there; he keeps a common barber's shop; he stated he signed the deed, and paid the deposit, and held the shares.

10016. It is a common barber's shop?—Yes; it says, "Shave well for a penny," in the window.

10017. What should you say the rent of the house was?—My knowledge of rent there is not very good; I should not say it was worth more than 30*l.* a year, or 40*l.*

10018. To let out in lodgings?—Yes; it is set out in different apartments.

10019. Does he occupy the lower part of it?—He may occupy other parts of it; but I do not know what parts; I did not inquire into that.

10020. How do you know it?—I had occasion to inquire of a person of the name of Maber, who lives in a part of the same house, and learned it from him.

10021. "John Stone, Wood-street, Cheapside;" did you inquire after him?—Yes; no such person resides as above; Mr. Tomlinson is the occupier of the same.

10022. "Frances Place," the last was, on the 6th page; did you inquire there?—Yes.

10023. Did you find Mr. Place?—I have not got the memorandum; I recollect calling there.

10024. Did you find him?—No; it is a Manchester warehouse, and the parties who are there now have been there six months; he might have been a clerk in the place, but they knew nothing of him.

10025. Did they give you the names of the previous occupants?—Yes, Pedley & Co., who were gone to Finsbury-square.

10026. Did you inquire there for him?—No; but a person of the name of Stevens did.

10027. "John Symes, No. 1, Hatton-wall, victualler;" have you tried at that place?—Yes, I did.

10028. What did you find there?—The first time I applied, he stated he had signed the deed for a brother of his. I had occasion to go past a few days ago, and I found the house shut up, in company with a person of the name of Stevens; we knocked at the house and went in, and found an execution at the suit of the Crown

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

28 April 1837.

Crown for 200*l.*, and that John Symes had run away and was not to be found; but Mrs. Symes was in the house.

10029. Do you know whether any advertisements had appeared?—I have heard it, but do not know it of my own knowledge.

10030. "James Pananco," on the first page; did you inquire after this gentleman?—I went to different houses, knowing some of them; I went to Garraway's and the eating-house, and to the chambers, and to the porters, and I inquired of the ticket-porters about the place, and they stated to me they had never heard the name; and a person of the name of Stevens has followed me, and I believe he has learnt the same.

10031. "Thomas Mellish;" have you inquired at the address you find here?—Yes; 13, Georgiana-terrace, Kinder-street, Old Kent-road.

10032. Did you find him there?—No; he had resided there, but had removed, and the party did not know where.

10033. "Frederick Langley," page 4; did you inquire for this person at the address given of him?—Yes, I did.

10034. What did you find?—At 4, Taunton-place, Regent's Park; I found he had removed about a fortnight; I made inquiry about a month ago.

10035. Could you ascertain where he was removed to?—I inquired about the neighbourhood, and they could not inform me; I went back and made further inquiries of the persons who kept the house; they sell milk; but they did not know where he was gone to; but they mentioned the name of the person on the van that moved the goods; I do not know the name of the party; it was Berners-street; I inquired several times, and I traced him to 54, George-street, Hampstead-road; I then called upon him, and left with the person who represented herself to be his wife an appointment to meet me in the city, as he had offices there she named, No. 11, Poultry, at two o'clock in the day, as I was there in the morning; I attended at No. 11 accordingly; it is a billiard-room and warm baths; he was not there; I saw a person of the name of Jones, who stated him to be Captain Langley; I attended the second time with Mr. Stevens, and went into the subscribers' room, where there were three persons; we asked for Frederick Langley, and he being one of the three parties, they denied there was any such party there.

10036. What do you mean there, being one of the three?—He being one of the three parties.

10037. *Chairman.*] How did you know it?—That will appear. Upon my mentioning the business, he stated his name to be Langley, and apologized for the deception by stating he was in difficulty, and through lending his name to bills; stated he signed the deed and paid the deposits, and bought other shares also in the market to the amount of 190, some at a premium, through the persuasion of Mr. Disney, a director, who was a friend of his; he went to the office when the shares had got up to one and a half, from a half to five-eighths, when Mr. Beetham and Mr. Disney advised him still to keep them, as they would be in the course of of next week at a higher premium. Mr. Knight, of Newcastle-street, Clerkenwell, advanced him 200*l.* on the shares, and who now holds them; he was induced further to go into the speculation by one Mr. Dalrymple.

10038. What is this person at Clerkenwell who advanced the money?—A friend of Mr. Langley's; I presume him to have been a friend to have lent him the 200*l.*; he appears to have signed the London, Shoreham and Brighton Railway, "Frederick Langley, 4, Taunton-place, Regent's-park, 15 shares, 1,500*l.*;" Westminster Bridge and Deptford, at the same place, "50 shares, 2,500*l.*;" South Western, same place, "165 shares, 8,250*l.*"

10039. Mr. *Bircham.*] Have you told us all you know of Langley?—Yes, all I recollect at present; except that I had occasion to go to Mr. Bozon, the solicitor, relative to Langley, Hamilton and Gurney, when Mr. Bozon stated——

10040. Who is Mr. Bozon?—A solicitor in a court in Broad-street; he merely spoke of the party being in difficulties, and unable to pay the money.

10041. "Archibald Ker;" have you been at the residence here pointed out?—I have been to 46, on the deed, but I found the party at 41, Robert-street, Hoxton; I have been there several times.

10042. The last time you saw him?—I saw him, he stated to me he had been in the office of a person of the name of Dalrymple, living in Abchurch-lane, wine-merchant; he stated he signed the deed for Mr. Dalrymple, and that he was to

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

28 April 1837.

hold him harmless. I then asked him whether he was of age at the time he signed the deed, and he stated it would depend upon the time the deed was signed last year; that he is now between 21 and 22 years of age; he stated it was out of his power to pay the money; and under the circumstances, if he had the money, he would not pay a farthing, provided he is responsible upon the deed.

10043. Did he state what took place at the railway-office when he went there first?—He stated he took a cheque for 100*l.*, and paid 100 *l.*; the shares were sent to him, and I believe sent to the house; the money was paid first, and the shares sent afterwards; those shares were sold to Mr. Dalrymple at one-eighth premium; and at the time he signed the deed, he stated to me that the party must have known he was signing for shares belonging to Mr. Dalrymple, and not to himself.

10044. Did he give any reasons for that?—Yes, that Mr. Dalrymple was known to the directors, and that it was through the influence of one or two of the directors that Mr. Dalrymple got the shares; I believe it was Mr. Disney, I am not sure. He signed the South Midland Counties, as "Archibald Ker, 46, Robert-street, Hoxton, gentleman, 55 shares, 2,750*l.*;" the South Western, "31, Abchurch-lane, 5,000 *l.*"

10045. "William Edward Tekusche, 80, Fleet-street"?—I do not recollect such a name as that; there is no such a name on the deed.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated to the Committee that the names mentioned by the witness having now been given for the first time, he would rather postpone the cross-examination till he had had time to make inquiries into those parties.

The *Chairman* acceded to the course suggested by Mr. Clarkson, and the cross-examination was postponed.

[The Witness withdrew.

John Hurle, called in; and Examined, as follows:

John Hurle.

10046. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?—A surveyor.

10047. Where do you live?—17, Rahere-street, Goswell-road.

10048. Mr. *Hill.*] Whose employment are you in?—No one's now.

10049. You are a draughtsman?—Yes, a draughtsman and surveyor.

10050. Are you a drawing clerk?—No, a surveyor.

10051. Were you in Mr. Blunt's employment lately?—Yes I was, two months ago.

10052. What wages did he give you?—Two guineas a week.

10053. Did you sign this subscription deed?—Yes, I did, for Mr. Blunt.

10054. What do you mean by doing it for Mr. Blunt?—He told me he could not sign it himself, he being an officer to the company.

10055. How many shares did you subscribe for?—I think it was 75, to the best of my recollection.

10056. Where was it you signed it?—At Mr. Blunt's office.

10057. Who was present?—Mr. Blunt was present, and two or three gentlemen belonging to Mr. Beetham, the solicitor.

10058. *Chairman.*] Who were they?—I do not know their names; I should not know them again if I were to see them.

10059. Mr. *Hill.*] Who were they?—I do not know; I understood they were from Mr. Beetham's.

10060. Was Mr. Beetham there?—I do not know; I should not know him if I was to see him.

10061. Do you know Mr. Gethen?—No.

10062. Look and see if you know any of those gentlemen?—No, I do not see any.

10063. It was somebody who had the deed?—Yes, there were two or three gentlemen; I did not take particular notice.

10064. Did you hear their names?—No.

10065. *Chairman.*] Tell us all that passed?—Mr. Blunt asked me if I would hold 75 shares for him, and he would supply me with the money to pay the demand; that is the whole of it.

10066. Mr. *Hill.*] Has he supplied you with any money?—No, I had no call for any.

10067. Did any money pass upon that occasion?—Not a penny.

10068. Have

10068. Have you ever held any shares in this concern?—No.

10069. *Chairman.*] When you signed, did you see the attesting witness put his name to your signature?—Yes; I should not know him again if I was to see him. I signed a couple of papers. [*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*] That is my name, and that is my writing: "John Hurle, 17, Rahere-street, Goswell-road, architect, 75, 3,550 *l.*; William Gethen."

10070. Mr. *Hill.*] Who told you to call yourself an architect?—Mr. Blunt; an architect is a surveyor, as far as I am able to judge.

10071. Did anybody tell you to call yourself an architect?—No.

10072. Why did you say Mr. Blunt did?—He told me to put down my name as an architect; architect and surveyor is all the same thing.

10073. What means have you to pay 3,500 *l.*?—I have no means till Mr. Blunt furnishes me with the sum to do so.

10074. *Chairman.*] What means have you of paying 150 *l.* deposit?—I have no means; Mr. Blunt was to supply me with the money, but I understood him the deposit was paid.

10075. Mr. *Hill.*] He told you it was paid?—Yes.

10076. Had you any conversation with Mr. Harris upon the subject?—No; Mr. Harris was taken away, and went to the city offices to sign his shares.

10077. Did you tell Mr. Harris what you had done when he came back?—Yes, I did; he did not understand what he had been doing, and he told me—

10078. What did you say to him upon that?—I did not make any remark, as far as I recollect.

10079. Did you understand what you had been doing?—Yes; I was holding them for Mr. Blunt, as far as I understood.

10080. Did you understand that, by signing the deed, you had made yourself responsible to pay up the shares?—Yes, certainly I did; but Mr. Blunt was to supply me with the money.

10081. Did you know that, if he did not supply you with the money, they might come upon you?—Yes, I knew that.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

10082. How long were you with Mr. Blunt?—Till two months back.

10083. Had you filled the capacity of architect before you went to him?—Yes.

10084. How long?—About 14 years I have been upon my own hands.

10085. Is Mr. Blunt a man of respectability and responsibility?—I do not know; he is the man that employed me to make certain drawings.

10086. Where does he live?—I do not know; 85, Fleet-street, is his office.

10087. Mr. Blunt told you, being an officer of the company, he could not hold shares himself, but if you would sign for 75 shares, he would hold you harmless, and had paid the deposit?—Yes.

10088. Have you any reason to believe he will forfeit his word in that respect?—No.

10089. Have you any shares in the Southampton Railway?—No.

10090. *Chairman.*] Did you ever sign a deed before on behalf of any person?—No.

10091. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You say you have never had the shares?—No.

10092. Do you know, from Mr. Blunt, whether he has had the shares?—I never heard him say.

10093. You say Mr. Blunt told you to put your name down as an architect; was that the time when you were subscribing the deed?—Yes, it was.

10094. You signed your name; did you then describe your situation in life?—Yes; architect.

10095. Is that your proper description?—Architect and surveyor; I have been brought up such.

10096. Suppose Mr. Blunt had not told you to put down your description, what should you have put down?—Architect.

10097. You were saved the trouble of deciding by the suggestion?—Yes.

10098. You have been asked something about what you told Mr. Harris, and what Mr. Harris told you; who is Mr. Harris?—He was examined.

10099. He was a clerk of Mr. Blunt's?—Yes.

10100. Have you been at all troubled about these shares?—There have been some gentlemen at my house 20 times, but I have never seen them.

John Hurle.

28 April 1837.

10101. Those gentlemen who go about inquiring persons' means?—Yes, they went to every house and shop in the street to inquire about the people, and the manner of living, and so on.

10102. Were they people belonging to the Southampton Railway Company? —I do not know.

10103. Perhaps you never saw the Southampton Railway Company's deed? —No.

Re-examined by Mr. *Hill.*

10104. My learned friend has asked you some questions about Mr. Blunt; do you happen to know that Mr. Blunt has been a bankrupt?—No, I do not.

10105. There were several gentlemen with the deed?—There were two or three with Mr. Blunt.

10106. Had they any conversation with you?—No, they merely told me where to put my name.

[The Witness withdrew.

William Blofield, called in; and Examined, as follows:

William Blofield.

10107. Mr. *Hill.*] I see you are the last signature on the list; did you sign for 36 shares?—I did.

10108. What are you?—A builder.

10109. Builder?—Yes, a bricklayer and builder, Hosier-lane, West Smithfield.

10110. Are you a master bricklayer and builder?—Yes.

10111. How long have you been so?—Ever since I was 25 years old; about 17 years.

10112. Have you been in Mr. Laxton's service?—No.

10113. Have you been connected with him in any way?—He has done work for me as a surveyor, and I have done work under him as a builder.

10114. You have never been employed in his office?—No.

10115. He is an engineer?—He is the architect and engineer on this occasion.

10116. How long have you known Mr. Laxton?—About 10 years.

10117. How long has he been a surveyor?—Before I knew him.

10118. Was not he an auctioneer?—His father was.

10119. Was he an auctioneer?—There was Laxton & Nicholls.

10120. Was he an auctioneer?—Yes.

10121. Why did you not say so?—About 10 years ago.

10122. You have known him 10 years, you say?—Yes.

10123. Then you knew him as an auctioneer?—No, only a surveyor.

10124. Did you ever know him as an engineer?—No.

10125. Did you pay the deposits upon those shares?—No, I did not.

10126. Why did you not?—I understood they had been paid by Mr. Laxton.

10127. What had he to do with the shares?—It was his request I should sign (*holding out a letter*).

10128. Do you wish me to look at that letter?—Yes, I do.

[*The following letter was read:*]

"Dear Sir; You will very much oblige me if you will call at Mr. Beetham's office, No. 8, Chatham-place, Blackfriars, this afternoon, any time before eight o'clock, and sign for 36 shares, which I am obliged to take in the City Railway Company, but I cannot take them myself.

"Yours, &c., *H. Laxton.*"

"To Mr. Blofield, builder, Hosier-lane."

10129. You signed for 36 shares?—I did.

10130. *Chairman.*] What is the date of that letter?—There is no date.

10130*. When did you receive that?—It was some time the latter end of January, and I only found it again this morning, on looking over the papers to see if I could find it.

10131. You paid no deposit at all?—No.

10132. Have you funds to meet 1,800*l.*?—I have funds to meet 500 *l.* or 600*l.*: it is not necessary; I might do it in the time if my business went on.

10133. Have you been a bankrupt?—Yes.

10134. How

10134. How long ago?—In the year 1833, August the 29th, and had my certificate December the 25th of the same year. *William Blofield* 28 April 1837

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

10135. Then, am I understand that you signed this deed on the part of Mr. Laxton, who could not sign himself, because he was one of the officers of the railway, knowing and believing he would indemnify you, and save you harmless?—Yes.

10136. Is he a man responsible to the extent of 1,800 *l.*?—I should think so.

10137. And the Southampton Company have found out you were a bankrupt in 1833. Are you able to pay 500*l.* or 600*l.* now?—Yes, I am.

10138. My learned friend has asked you if you knew anything of Mr. Laxton as an auctioneer; did you know him as an auctioneer or as a surveyor?—I knew him as a surveyor; I have seen his name with Mr. Nicholls as an auctioneer.

10139. Have you reason to believe that is his name?—Yes.

10140. Laxton has paid the deposit upon them?—Yes, he told me so; if he has not, I am ready to do it if called upon.

10141. Have you any reason to doubt Mr. Laxton will honourably perform his engagement to you?—No, or I would not have signed it; I never signed anything of the kind before.

[The Witness withdrew.

It appeared that Francis Beetham had attested the signature of Blofield to the deed.

Thomas Arnold, called in; and Examined, as follows:

10142. Mr. *Hill.*] DID you sign this deed for 30 shares?—Yes, I did. *Thomas Arnold.*

10143. Francis Beetham witnessed your signature?—Yes, I believe he did.

10144. What are you?—I am a grocer.

10145. Where do you carry on your business?—I am out of business at the present time.

10146. How long have you been out of business?—Nearly two years; but I have commissions, and I consider myself as a grocer at the present time.

10147. Why do you call yourself a grocer, if you are out of business?—I profess myself a grocer.

10148. You do not practise?—Yes, I do practise; I manufacture glaze; I am a commission-agent.

10149. Is that the reason you call yourself a grocer, because you are a commission agent?—As soon as an opportunity offers I will take it.

10150. Is that the reason you call yourself a grocer, because you manufacture glaze?—No; I was brought up a grocer.

10151. Where did you practise last?—At the Isle of Wight, West Cowes.

10152. When did you leave West Cowes?—Eight years ago.

10153. You have not been a grocer for eight years?—I have been since that at Maidstone.

10154. I asked you the place you were last in business, and you said West Cowes?—I have since been at Maidstone.

10155. Is that the last time?—No; I have been with an uncle of mine at Aylsford in Kent.

10156. As a grocer?—Yes.

10157. When did you go to Aylsford in Kent?—Four years ago.

10158. How long did you remain in the condition of a shopman there?—I was there some time.

10159. What was your reason for leaving West Cowes and going to Aylsford, where you were a shopman; did you fail?—No; I was then doing business with a father of mine.

10160. Were you a partner with him?—No, I was doing business with him, and in consequence of his failure I disposed of my business.

10161. You were not a partner?—No, not at all with him.

10162. Had you the same shop?—I was in business for myself at Cowes, in the Isle of Wight, and did business for my father; and in consequence of my father's failure, I disposed of my business: I purchased goods of my father.

Thomas Arnold.

28 April 1837.

10163. Where did your father carry on business?—In Southampton.

10164. And you in Cowes?—Yes.

10165. When he failed, you shut up your shop?—Not exactly; that I kept open three or four months afterwards; but I wanted somebody's assistance, and in consequence of that, then I disposed of my own.

10166. Then you went to Aylsford?—Yes.

10167. How long did you remain with your uncle as a shopman?—I was with him, off and on, two or three years.

10168. What were you doing when you were off?—Looking out for something for myself.

10169. How long have you left your uncle's?—I have been in London some time; I have been clerk to a builder for two or three years.

10170. Is that the last occupation you had?—Yes, except my own profession; I was a commission-agent.

10171. Did you ask what you were to put down when you called yourself a grocer; did you ask what you were to call yourself?—I am a grocer, and cannot call myself anything else.

10172. Did you ask any one what you were to put down?—No, certainly not.

10173. Thirty shares; when did you sign this deed?—I am sure I cannot state the date exactly.

10174. You are the last-named but three?—I think it was in February; I cannot state exactly.

10175. Have you any shares in the concern?—Any shares in the concern? I do not understand you; put the question more pointedly, and perhaps I can answer it.

10176. Have you any share in this undertaking, in respect of which you signed the deed?—I have shares for what I have signed.

10177. You have shares for what you have signed?—Yes.

10178. Where are they?—In my possession.

10179. Have you got them here?—Yes.

10180. Just let us look at them, will you? [*The Witness produced some parchments, and they were handed to Mr. Hill.*]

10181. How long had you had these in your possession when you signed the deed?—I had not them in my possession until after I had signed the deed.

10182. When did you receive those four pieces of paper, or parchment?—I had them according to the date you have there, 18th March 1836.

10183. How was it you had them not in your possession when you signed the deed?—I did not have them exactly on that date; I cannot say exactly to the date; I am sure I cannot say exactly to the date. I think you have made a mistake, it was in the month of March I received them.

10184. Was it last March that ever was; can you tell it was the last month you received them?—No; I do not think it was last month.

10185. How long have you had them?—I have had them about two months, I suppose.

10186. Now take care what answer you are giving; you told me first you had them at the time they bore date; you told me next, you had them in March?—I considered it was the time; I thought it was March 1837: excuse me.

10187. If you have had them two months, you had them before March; did you expect they were dated before they were delivered?—No; I have had them about two months in my possession.

10188. Give me some answer you will abide by; when was the first time you had or saw these three pieces of parchment?—I have had them two months in my possession.

10189. Was that the first time you saw them?—Yes.

10190. How did you come by them?—I received them from the secretary; that gentleman sitting there.

10191. Mr. Gethen?—Yes.

10192. What did you give him for them?—I gave him nothing for them; of course the deposit had been previously paid to him.

10193. At that time when Mr. Gethen gave you these, you gave him nothing for them; did you do anything?—No.

10194. Nothing at all?—No.

10195. Was

10195. Was it before or after you had signed the deed?—After I had signed the deed.

10196. How long after?—Some considerable time after.

10197. It was some considerable time after you signed the deed that you received these three pieces of parchment?—Yes.

10198. You never gave anything for them?—I will explain.

10199. Answer the question first. Did you ever give anything for those three pieces of parchment, or either of them?—No, I did not.

10200. Now your explanation?—I signed the deed as a favour to Mr. Laxton, the engineer to the company, a gentleman I have known some time; and being an officer to the company, he wished me to sign for 70 shares for him, as he was not allowed to take up shares in his own name.

10201. He said so to you?—He wished me to do it.

10202. Are they his shares?—They are my shares, I consider.

10203. They cannot be yours and his too?—No, certainly not; he has paid the deposit for them.

10204. You have paid nothing for them?—No.

10205. Do you mean to pay anything?—Provided he does not pay them when an instalment becomes due.

10206. Explain how they came to give them to you?—I have signed for them, have I not?

10207. Do not you examine me?—I have signed for them; that is evident.

10208. I ask how it was, since it was some considerable time after you signed, that these shares were given to you; and since you never paid anything for them, and since you were asked to sign as a favour to Mr. Laxton, in respect of shares he was not allowed to take up in his own name, how it was that those were given to you at all?—I do not know; I should think Mr. Laxton would be better able to answer that; they were given to me at the office.

10209. What were you doing at the office?—I am sure I cannot answer.

10210. What brought you there?—I went there to see a party.

10211. Who?—Not Mr. Laxton.

10212. Who was it?—Mr. Blunt.

10213. What did you go to see him about?—I do not know about that; that is private business.

10214. I must inquire; it is at the railway office; what was it about?—I cannot exactly tell.

10215. How do you know it was private business, if you do not know what it was?—Because I was then in expectation of getting some employment under Mr. Blunt, understanding he had a Government contract.

10216. Did you see him?—No, I did not.

10217. Is he a friend of yours?—I know him very well

10218. Did he ever talk to you about signing the deed?—He never asked me the question.

10219. That is not the question. Did he ever talk to you about it?—Never.

10220. How came those shares to be put into your hands; did you ask for them?—They were my right; Mr. Gethen handed them over to me.

10221. Did you ask for them?—No, I did not.

10222. So Mr. Gethen forced them upon you?—No, he did not; I took them.

10223. He offered them to you, you not having asked for them?—No; he said Mr. Arnold, that is your right; and of course I took them.

10224. How came they to be your right; they were Mr. Laxton's?—Mr. Laxton was my friend, and he could entrust them to me.

10225. Why were you to hold them?—Because I had signed in trust for him.

10226. So Mr. Gethen said, "Mr. Arnold, you are entitled to these, these are your right"?—Yes, he asked to that effect.

10227. How often have you been at the office?—Several times.

10228. You think a hundred times?—No.

10229. What did you go for?—Like many others, to obtain a situation if I could get one, most likely.

10230. At the office?—Yes.

10231. You were trying for a situation there?—Yes.

10232. What

Thomas Arnold.

28 April 1837.

10232. What situation did you expect, that of a grocer or a manufacturer of glaze?—No, I should think not.

Mr. *Clarkson* inquired whether it was usual before Committee for the counsel to cross-examine his own witness.

The *Chairman* stated that it was requisite the counsel should conduct the examination by putting questions best calculated to elicit the truth, leading the witness as little as possible.

10233. Mr. *Hill.*] You live at 15, Denmark-street?—Yes.

10234. Are you a lodger there?—Yes.

10235. Have you a family?—Yes.

10236. And they live there?—Yes, they do.

10237. It is a grocer's shop there?—No.

10238. Not at 15, Denmark-street?—No.

10239. It is a chandler's shop?—No, a dairy.

10240. Have you the second floor?—Yes.

10241. What means have you of paying 1,500*l.*?—In a good speculation I am satisfied I could produce twice 1,500*l.*

10242. What property have you to the amount of 1,500*l.*?—What property have I to the amount of 1,500*l.*?

10243. Yes?—I do not say I have any property exactly to that amount, but I could produce it upon a good speculation.

10244. Do you mean, if you could show a good speculation for 1,500*l.*, you have friends who would advance it?—Yes.

10245. Have you any property of your own?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

10246. Do you contemplate taking any Southampton Company's shares?—No.

10247. Those shares you took as a favour for Mr. Laxton?—Yes.

10248. He being the person that paid the deposits?—Yes.

10249. Have you every reason to suppose he is able to pay that 1,500*l.*?—Yes.

10250. You say you have been concerned in doing business upon commission, and manufacturing glaze; is glaze an article dealt in by grocers?—Yes, it is; by the Italian warehouses.

10251. You signed in February this year or last year?—In this year.

10252. The date has not been altered since originally printed in 1836; they are all in the state you received them?—Yes, they are; they have never been out of my possession.

10253. Did you see Mr. Green and the rest of the persons who came to inquire about you?—I saw two gentlemen.

10254. Gentlemen?—Gentlemen I cannot style them, their conduct was not such.

10255. You saw Mr. Green?—I do not know who they were; I did not know their names exactly.

10256. Did they tell you who they came from?—No.

10257. Did you ask them?—They asked me if I had signed the Parliamentary deed.

10258. Did you ask them who they came from?—No; they asked me if my name was Arnold.

10259. Give a direct answer?—They knocked at the door, and I answered it.

10260. When was it they came?—I cannot exactly say; I suppose a month ago.

10261. They did not tell you from whom they came?—No.

10262. You did not inquire?—No; I had a number of persons calling for me; I did not inquire.

[*The following is a copy of the parchment Certificate delivered in by the Witness:*]

"City Railway.

"Capital 1,000,000*l.*, in shares of 50*l.* each; deposit, 2*l.* per share.

"Certificate for 10 Shares.

"No. 687. The holder of the above shares having paid the deposit of 2*l.* per share, and signed the Parliamentary engagement, and having agreed to pay all calls

calls in respect thereof, is the proprietor of 10 shares in the above undertaking. London, March 18th, 1836. Entered. *Thomas Arnold.*

28 April 1837.

" *H. C. Dakeyne,*
" *C. Eastgood,* } Members of the Committee.
" *J. K. Polhill,*

" *W. Geetham,* Assistant Secretary."

No. 688, the same as above.
No. 689, the same as above.

[The Witness withdrew.

Henry Holland, called in; and Examined, as follows:

Henry Holland.

10263. Mr. *Hill.*] DID you sign this deed for 30 shares?—Yes.
10264. That is for 1,500*l.*?—Yes.
10265. Are you a shareholder to that amount?—I hold the shares.
10266. Have you got them?—I have not them with me; I have got them at home.
10267. How many papers have you, or parchments?—Three.
10268. Do you remember the date of them?—I think I remember the month of March being mentioned, but that is all I remember.
10269. Do you remember by whom they are signed?—By three of the directors, I think, of the company, and by the secretary.

Mr. *Beetham* admitted that all the shares were signed by three of the directors, and countersigned by the secretary.

10270. Was Mr. Esgood one?—I do not recollect the name.
10271. When did you sign this deed?—The latter end of January.
10272. Francis Beetham witnessed your signature?—Yes.
10273. Where did you sign?—At his office.
10274. Is that the railway-office?—No, his own office.
10275. Where is it?—Near Blackfriars Bridge.
10276. Had you the shares when you signed?—No.
10277. How came you to sign?—I was asked by a friend to sign.
10278. Who is that friend?—Mr. Laxton.
10279. Are you in the employment of any party?—I am not; by-the-bye, I believe I am in two or three employments.
10280. In what way?—I am his draughtsman.
10281. Do you go from office to office?—To do business on my own account; and I do business also for professional men; so that I am both architect and draughtsman.
10282. Did you pay any deposits?—No, I did not.
10283. Were you in Mr. Laxton's office at that time?—No.
10284. Were you employed by him?—Yes.
10285. As what?—As a surveyor.
10286. Did you make surveys for this railway?—I did.
10287. As employed by him?—Yes.
10288. How long have you been making surveys?—I believe I commenced nearly about Christmas twelvemonth.
10289. And worked continually from that time?—No; I was engaged in other matters, for other people, as well.
10290. Who paid you for the surveys, Mr. Laxton?—Yes.
10291. So much per week?—So much per day.
10292. For the days actually employed?—Yes.
10293. Did he go with you to sign the deed?—No.
10294. Did you go by yourself?—Yes, I did.
10295. Who did you see at the office?—Mr. Beetham and Mr. Mayew.
10296. Who was he?—He was in the employment of Mr. Beetham.
10297. You are one of his clerks?—Yes.
10298. Did you tell Mr. Beetham what you had come to do?—Yes.
10299. What did you tell him?—That I had come from Mr. Laxton to sign for 30 shares.
10300. Did you pay any deposit?—No.

 10301. Have

Henry Holland.

28 April 1837.

10301. Have you paid any money at all?—No.

10302. How came you to have those shares?—They were sent to me.

10303. How long after you had signed?—They were sent to me the latter end of March.

10304. By whom?—Mr. Laxton.

10305. Had you had made any application about them?—No.

10306. Had you heard of the petitions against this company, with respect to their subscription list, at that time?—I had not.

10307. Mr. Laxton sent you these shares?—Yes.

10308. Did you know you incurred any responsibility by signing the deed?—At the time I signed it, I did not; I signed it for my friend. It was said, at the moment I was leaving his office one night, "Just call at Mr. Beetham's, and sign for the 30 shares;" I said, "What railway is it?" he said, "Never mind, Mr. Beetham knows all about it; tell him you came from me."

10309. You did not even know the railway?—No.

10310. Was the deed read over to you?—No.

10311. You had not read it?—No; I had read the bill; I do not know whether that is the deed, or whether it comprehends it or not; that is the only thing I have read.

10312. *Chairman.*] At the time of signing it, had you read either the bill or the deed?—No.

10313. Mr. *Hill.*] At the time of signing, you did not know what railway it was?—No, I did not.

10314. Do you know Henry Miller, of Rahere-street, Goswell-road?—I do not know; I know a person of the name of Miller.

10315. Does he call himself an architect?—I do not know.

10316. Was there a person in Mr. Laxton's employment of the name of Miller?—Yes.

10317. Was he in the same line of employment as you were?—Yes.

10318. You call yourself a draughtsman?—Yes; I am an architect also.

10319. Did you ever build anything?—Yes.

10320. Do you know anything of Miller?—I do not know anything of him; or at least I know very little of him.

10321. You know there was a person of the name of Miller in Mr. Laxton's employment?—Yes.

10322. Do you know he lived in Goswell-street-road?—I have heard of Goswell-street.

10323. Is Rahere-street, Goswell-street-road, his home?—I do not know.

10324. Mr. Laxton said Mr. Beetham knew all about it?—Yes.

10325. Did you know Mr. Beetham?—Yes.

10326. How long have you known him?—I only know him from having seen him, and knowing him as the solicitor of the City Railway.

10327. Where have you seen him?—Occasionally at the City Railway offices.

10328. Had you gone there upon business?—Yes.

10329. Have you had business with Mr. Beetham?—Yes.

10330. Did he know you?—I dare say he did; he can answer that better than I.

10331. You have been at the office several times?—Yes.

10332. Have you done any work there beyond drawing?—Yes, but I dare say Mr. Beetham never saw me there at that time.

10333. Do you consider yourself able to pay 1,500*l.*?—I do not.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

10334. You say you did this as a favour to Mr. Laxton?—Yes.

10335. Mr. Laxton was one of the parties employed originally upon the railway?—Yes.

10336. Did he give you any indemnity upon doing so?—No.

10337. Had you indemnity from Mr. Laxton?—I do not think I understand the word.

10338. Any guarantee to save you harmless?—He gave me his word; that was the only guarantee.

10339. Were

10339. Were you satisfied with it; have you any reason to suppose Mr. Laxton will leave you in the lurch?—No, I have not. Perhaps I may be allowed to state one particular, that Mr. Laxton wrote to me to say he had paid the deposits himself, in my name. *Henry Holland.* 28 April 1837.

10340. *Chairman.*] At what time?—At the time he forwarded the shares to me.

10341. Mr. *Hill.*] Have you got the letter?—No, I can send it, if necessary.

10342. Have you been talking to Mr. Laxton this morning?—Yes, but not upon that subject.

The Witness was directed to send to the Committee clerk the shares and the letter received from Mr. Laxton.

[The Witness withdrew.

Henry Laxton, called in; and Examined, as follows:

10343. Mr. *Hill.*] ARE you an architect?—I am. *Henry Laxton.*

10344. In practice for yourself?—Yes.

10345. Are you engaged in this railway?—Yes, I have been.

10346. You are?—I have been engaged.

10347. In what capacity?—As an architect.

10348. For the railway?—Yes, employed for the railway.

10349. What have you done for them?—Made drawings.

10350. Who paid you?—My brother, the engineer.

10351. You consider yourself in his employ, and not that of the company?—Yes, exactly so.

10352. You have signed for 50 shares?—I have so.

10353. What date was it?—About the end of January.

10354. Two thousand five hundred pounds?—Yes.

10355. Have you the 50 shares?—Yes, I have.

10356. Have you them here?—I have.

10357. Will you produce them?—[*The Witness produced five pieces of parchment, which were handed to Mr. Hill.*]

10358. These shares bear date April 6th?—Yes.

10359. 1837?—Yes.

10360. Was that the time you received them?—No, I suppose since then; I do not know the time exactly; since then, perhaps.

10361. Under what circumstances did you receive them, and did you apply for them?—I was told when I signed they would be sent to me; therefore they were sent.

10362. Who told you that?—Mr. Beetham, when I signed.

10363. Francis Beetham?—Yes, he said he would send them.

10364. When were they sent?—I do not know the date.

10365. How long ago; you say it was since the 6th of April, and we are still in April; it must be a very short time ago?—

10366. *Chairman.*] Come, sir, as near as you can remember; when were they sent to you?—I should think about three weeks ago; I cannot recollect.

10367. Have you a memorandum of the date?—I think I have.

10368. You think it is three weeks ago?—It may be two or three weeks ago; I do not see any memorandum of it.

10369. How came you to sign; under what circumstances did you sign for these 50 shares?—I wanted some shares.

10370. At that time?—At that time.

10371. At the end of January?—Yes.

10372. You wanted your shares at the end of January; it was then you began to want shares?—Yes.

10373. Did you buy any shares?—I signed for the shares, which was tantamount.

10374. Was that all you did?—That was all I did.

10375. Did you pay any deposits?—The deposits were paid.

Chairman.] Do not give an evasive answer; give a direct answer; and if you want to add any explanation, add it afterwards.

Henry Laxton.

28 April 1837.

10376. Mr. *Hill.*] You say you did not pay any?—No.

10377. You say they were paid?—Yes.

10378. Who paid them?—My brother paid them for me.

10379. Do you know that?—He told me.

10380. When did he tell you?—About the time I received the shares.

10381. At the time you signed, you did not know that any deposits had been paid?—No; but my brother was to pay it for me; it was with that understanding, that he should pay.

10382. Was your brother with you when you signed?—No.

10383. Had you had any communication with him previously?—Yes, of course I had.

10384. What had occurred between you and your brother that led you to sign?—I wanted some shares.

10385. Did you apply to him?—Yes; or rather, in conversation, I said I wanted some shares.

10386. Where was that?—At my brother's office, I think; but I cannot tell exactly.

10387. This was about the latter end of January?—Yes.

10388. What did he tell you?—That if I would sign for some shares, I could have them.

10389. Did anything occur about the deposits?—He was to pay the deposits for me.

10390. Did he say so at the time?—Yes.

10391. That he would pay the deposits for you?—Yes, exactly so.

10392. Did you sign?—Yes, I did.

10393. Without any further communication with your brother?—Yes.

10394. And pretty soon afterwards?—Yes.

10395. The same day?—No.

10396. The next day?—No; three or four days afterwards.

10397. When did your brother tell you he had paid the deposits?—Two or three weeks ago.

10398. When did he tell you he had paid the deposits?—He did not tell me when.

10399. Had he any scrip at the time you applied for shares?—I do not know that he had.

10400. Did he tell you that he had?—No.

10401. Have you ever paid a farthing upon these?—No.

10402. Fifty shares is 2,500 *l.*?—Yes.

10403. Are you able to pay 2,500*l.*?—I dare say I may be at the time they are required.

10404. That is not my question?—I am not at this time; but there are five years allowed, if I am informed right.

10405. Did you live out at Kennington?—Yes.

10406. And removed since to Holborn?—Yes.

10407. Have you ever taken the benefit of the Insolvent Debtors' Act?—At that time I did; about 11 or 12 years ago.

10408. Do you happen to know that your creditors may come upon you at any time for any property you have?—I am aware of that; but they were principally liabilities; my debts were what are called liabilities.

10409. What does that mean?—Debts of other persons I was liable for.

10410. What other persons?—For bills.

10411. What other persons?—One of the name of Peacock, and another Wilson.

10412. Not your brother?—No.

10413. Are you quite certain of that?—Certainly not.

The parchments appeared to be numbered 731, 732, 733, 734 and 735, each for 10 shares.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Henry Sibley*, called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *Henry Sibley.*

10414. Mr. *Hill.*] WHAT are you?—I am clerk to an attorney in Gray's-inn-square.

10415. Are

10415. Are you an attorney yourself?—I am.

10416. Have you practised yourself?—I have.

10417. I see you are down here for 50 shares, you signed the deed for 50?—Yes, I did.

10418. Witnessed by Mr. William Gethen?—I do not recollect the name of gentleman who witnessed it; I did not know the gentleman.

10419. How long have you been clerk to another attorney?—Four years.

10420. Fifty shares you have subscribed for; when did you become possessed of those shares, or are you possessed of them?—No, I am not.

10421. Have you ever had any shares?—Never.

10422. How came you to sign the deed?—I did so at the request of Mr. Brown.

10423. Who is Mr. Brown?—Mr. Brown had some engagement with the company, I understood from him, and it was necessary he should be examined before the Committee of this House, and if Mr. Brown signed the deed he would not be a competent witness, and he requested me to sign for him.

10424. What was his Christian name?—George Brown.

10425. What capacity was he engaged in?—Getting some evidence for the company.

10426. What is his profession?—He has been a merchant.

10427. What is he now; has he failed?—No, he adopts this mode.

10428. Where does he live?—14 or 16, Southampton-street, Fitzroy-square.

10429. Is he a lodger there?—He is.

10430. He asked you to sign it for him?—Yes.

10431. Did he tell you how many shares he wished you to sign for?—He did.

10432. Did you go to the City Railway office?—Yes.

10433. Who did you see there?—I saw the gentleman that witnessed it.

10434. Had you been there before?—I called to sign it; but the deed was not there.

10435. Was that the first time you had been at the City Railway office?—I believe it was; I do not recollect ever having been there before; not upon this business, certainly.

10436. What other business had you at that office?—I might have called to see Mr. Brown, knowing he was occasionally employed there.

10437. Have you any other friend in the City Railway office?—No.

10438. Mr. Beetham?—No.

10439. Mr. Gethen?—No.

10440. When was it Mr. Brown asked you?—I think in the month of January, as far as my recollection serves me.

10441. In the beginning or the latter end?—I should say the beginning; I have no note to speak from.

10442. Recollect when it was you signed?—I should say it was in the month of January; I have no note of the date.

10443. The beginning or the latter end?—I should think the beginning.

10444. Was it immediately upon Mr. Brown asking you?—The week afterwards, I think.

10445. Was Mr. Brown with you?—No.

10446. Did you go alone?—I was accompanied by a gentleman from the office; the deed was at the bankers'.

10447. Who were the bankers?—I do not recollect the name.

10448. Some bankers in Lombard-street?—Yes.

10449. Was any gentleman with you?—The gentleman who witnessed it.

10450. Any other person who signed it; John Brandon, for instance?—No.

10451. Did you pay any deposits?—No, I did not.

10452. Did you not know that deposits are required on signing deeds?—I did.

10453. How came you not to pay any?—They were not my shares, they were Mr. Brown's shares.

10454. Were you asked for any deposits?—No, I was not.

10455. Have you had any remuneration for this?—None whatever.

Mr. *Henry Sibley.*

28 April 1837.

10456. Did you live at Southampton-buildings in 1832?—Earlier than that, it was before 1832.

10457. Did you take the benefit of the Insolvent Debtors' Act?—I did.

10458. In that year?—Yes.

10459. Since then you have been employed as a clerk to an attorney?—Yes.

10460. You have never had any shares given to you?—None.

10461. Have you had any connexion with this deed, except signing it?—No, that is all.

10462. How long have you been with Mr. Lander?—Just about four years.

10463. Is he concerned in any railway?—I believe not at present; he has been.

10464. In the Gloucester and Hereford Railway?—Yes.

10465. With Mr. Beetham?—Yes.

10466. Francis Beetham?—Yes.

10467. I scarcely need ask you, are you able to meet this claim upon 50 shares?—£. 2,500?

10468. Yes.—I am not.

10469. Was the deed read over to you?—No.

10470. But as a legal man, of course you knew what you were doing?—I understood so.

10471. Did you understand you were taking a legal responsibility for that sum?—I did.

10472. Have you any indemnity?—I have an assurance from Mr. Brown that if I was called upon to pay, he would hold me harmless, and I have sufficient faith in him.

10473. Do you know Mr. Brown to be a man of property?—I do not know it.

10474. Do you believe it?—If I had been called upon to pay any shares, he would have furnished me with the money.

10475. Do you know that he has the means; as a man of the world; you say he has been a merchant, and is now employed by the company?—

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the question.

Mr. *Hill* was heard in support of the question.

10476. *Chairman.*] Do you know anything of Mr. Brown's circumstances?—I do not.

10477. Mr. *Hill.*] You have no reason to know that he is responsible to the amount of this sum, or anything like it?—I have no knowledge of any property to lead me to believe he can pay it, or otherwise.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

10478. You do not know whether he can pay it or not?—No.

10479. You signed in confidence upon Mr. Brown, and you have the same confidence in him still?—Yes; I believe if I was called upon to pay the money, he would immediately reimburse me.

14480. You say Mr. Brown explained to you he could not sign the deed, and you signed for him, not thinking you were taking any responsibility upon you, though legally liable?—Certainly.

10481. Do you know Mr. Brown's handwriting?—Yes, I do.

10482. Is that paper signed by him [*handing a paper to the Witness*]?—Yes, it is.

10483. Do you know whether Mr. Brown is extensively concerned in different branches of railway business; do you know whether he is engaged in other matters besides this?—Yes, I do.

10484. You speak of getting up evidence?—Yes.

10485. Do you know whether Mr. Brown was engaged for the purpose of finding or arranging the traffic upon this line of road?—Yes, I do.

10486. Is that the nature of his employment in other speculations?—Yes.

10487. *Chairman.*] Do you mean making computations upon the quantity of traffic?—I believe so.

10488. Mr *Clarkson.*] Do you happen to know whether he is engaged in the same species of employment upon the Birmingham Railway?—The Great Western I know he was.

10489. And to the Southampton Company as well?—I do not recollect.

10490. As

Mr. *Henry Sibley.*

28 April 1837.

10490. As to his competency to pay, you have no knowledge of his property, but you took for granted he was competent, or you would not have represented him?—Certainly.

[The Witness withdrew.

William Cook, called in; and Examined, as follows:

William Cook.

10491. Mr. *Hill.*] YOU have signed the City Railway deed for 60 shares?—I have signed it, but I think only for 20 shares.

[*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*]

10492. How much is it; is that your name and handwriting?—Yes, I believe it is.

10493. Read the whole entry?—"William Cook, 8, Capel-court, S. E., (that is, Stock Exchange,) gentleman, 60 shares, 3,000*l.*"

10494. That is all in your handwriting?—I believe it is.

10495. Who is the attesting witness?—Francis Beetham.

10496. You find it is 60 shares?—Yes.

10497. You did not know you were so large a shareholder?—No.

10498. When did you sign it?—I cannot recollect; it appears on the document I suppose. It is some time since.

10499. Read any other entry you find there in your writing; [*The Deed was again shown to the Witness*]?—"William Cook, 8, Capel-court, S. E., gentleman, 20 shares, 1,000*l.*; Edward Beetham."

10500. That makes 80 shares?—Yes.

10501. You signed this deed twice for 80 shares altogether?—Yes, so it appears; I thought I had only signed it once for 20; I thought it was some other company.

10502. Do you sign for every company?—No, not every company.

10503. Sometimes?—Sometimes.

10504. What other railway companies have you signed in?—I cannot ascertain just now; do you wish to press the question?

10505. Yes, I do, very much.—I cannot tell; I signed some of the Brighton.

10506. Which of the Brighton; all the Brightons?—No.

10507. Which Brighton?—I believe I signed for Rennie's.

10508. How many shares have you signed for in Rennie's Line?—

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the question.
Mr. *Hill* was heard in support of the question.
The Committee decided that the question might be put.

10509. Mr. *Hill.*] How many shares are you down for upon all the deeds?—I really do not know.

10510. Five hundred shares?—No.

10511. Will you take upon yourself, to affirm with the same solemnity as if you were upon your oath, that you have not signed deeds for 500 shares?—I do not consider that I have.

10512. Will you say positively that you have not?—How can I say?

10513. It is very easy to say that; will you take upon you to say you have not signed deeds to the amount of 500 shares?—I cannot say I have.

10514. Can you say you have not?—Yes, I can.

10515. You are quite sure of that?—Yes.

10516. Put down the lowest number you are sure you have not signed for; have you signed for 400?—No, I am persuaded I have not.

10517. Can you say positively you have not signed for 400 shares upon any deeds?—I am persuaded I have not; I am confident I have not signed for 300.

10518. Can you say you have not signed to the amount of 400 shares upon all the deeds?—To my knowledge, I have not.

10519. Have you signed the South Midland?—Yes, I believe I have.

10520. For how much?—I really do not know.

10521. Have you signed the London, Salisbury and Exeter?—No, not to my knowledge.

10522. Will you take upon yourself to say you have not signed the London, Salisbury, Exeter, Plymouth and Falmouth Railway for 1,250*l.*?—I do not know that I have.

William Cook.

28 April 1837.

10523. Will you say positively that you have not?—No; but I do not think I have.

10524. The London and Exeter; have you signed that?—No, I think not.

10525. Will you tell me positively?—I do not know; I am not certain; I do not remember; where was the office?

10526. I cannot tell you where the office was.—That might bring it to my recollection.

10527. You do not know whether you did or not?—No, not without seeing my handwriting.

10528. The London and Brighton, Rennie's Line?—Yes.

10529. How much have you signed for there?—One hundred shares.

10530. What is the price of the shares?—I do not know; I have paid up the instalments, and signed the deed.

10531. *Chairman.*] Have you not signed Rennie's Line for 100 shares, 7,500*l.*?—I believe I did.

10532. Have you not signed it a second time for 82 shares; 6,150*l.*?—Eighty shares I signed for.

10533. Mr. *Hill.*] That makes altogether 13,650 *l.* for Rennie's Line?—How many thousands?

10534. Thirteen thousand six hundred and fifty. Are you aware that you are a supporter of Rennie's Line to the amount of 13,650 *l.*?—I suppose so.

10535. You signed this deed twice, you say; the City Railway deed?—Yes.

10536. Making 80 shares; 60 and 20?—Yes.

10537. When did you sign it the last time?—It is impossible for me to recollect; about two months ago.

10538. That would bring you to February?—Yes.

10539. How came you to recollect?—I signed it for my son, who is on the Stock Exchange.

10540. Who is he?—Henry Cook.

10541. What do you mean by being on the Stock Exchange; is he on the Stock Exchange now?—No.

10542. Where is he?—In Whitecross-street.

10543. What part of the street?—In the prison.

10544. You have signed it for him?—Yes.

10545. What was he when you signed it?—He was a clerk on the Stock Exchange.

10546. To whom was he clerk?—To Mr. Stokes.

10547. *Chairman.*] To what Mr. Stokes; what is the Christian name?—Edward Stokes, I believe.

10548. Mr. *Hill.*] The stockbroker to the City Railway?—A stockbroker.

10549. Did you pay any deposits?—Yes, I did, on the Brighton.

10550. Did you pay any deposits for these 80 shares?—Yes, I did.

10551. On the 60 you signed for last?—Yes.

10552. When?—At the time of signing it; there is the signature, and the date attached to it.

10553. You paid the deposits?—Yes.

10554. What did you pay?—1 *l.* a share, I believe.

10555. Now take care; was it 1 *l.* a share or not?—To the best of my belief, it was.

10556. Is that the deposit you paid?—Yes, and no doubt the instrument will state that.

10557. Was it put down on the deed?—Yes, it was a further call.

10558. A further call?—It was a call of 1 *l.* a share. Are you alluding to Rennie's Brighton?

10559. No, I have nothing to do with Rennie's Brighton.—

10560. *Chairman.*] We are talking about the City Railway?—I have paid 1 *l.* a share upon the 20 shares.

10561. Mr. *Hill.*] Are you quite sure you are speaking of the City Railway?—Yes.

10562. Where is the office?—Chatham-place, Blackfriars.

10563. Are you sure you paid any deposits upon the 20 shares?—Yes.

10564. How much?—£.20.

10564*. That you are quite sure of?—I will not be certain; the time has elapsed, and it was not very interesting to me, because I had no feeling upon the question; I made no profit by it; I had all my trouble.

10565. Are you sure you paid anything?—I am sure I paid 20*l.*

10566. What form was it in?—It was a further call.

10567. *Chairman.*] Was it in gold or bank-notes?—It was in bank-notes.

10568. Mr. *Hill.*] Was it a bank-note for 20*l.*?—It might be one or two bank-notes.

10569. Or three?—Yes. No, it could not be exactly three.

10570. Do you know at all; can you say it was in bank-notes?—Yes, I can; it was a bank-note or notes.

10571. Who gave them to you?—Mr. Henry Cook.

10572. Did he give them to you the same day?—Yes.

10573. That was about when?—I cannot recollect.

10574. It was last year, was not it?—No, it was this year.

10575. How long ago?—About two months.

10576. That is the 20 shares?—Yes.

10577. It was the 60 shares you signed two months ago, and the 20 shares you signed a long while ago: was it only two months ago you paid the 20*l.* on the 20 shares?—Yes.

10578. You are sure of that?—Yes.

10579. Did you ever pay anything upon the 60 shares?—Not that I know of; I do not recollect about paying anything.

10580. You did not pay anything upon them?—I think not.

10581. You paid the 20*l.* two months ago?—Yes.

10582. Now, take care of yourself; you must have signed this?—

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the form of the question, as dealing with the witness as if he was a hostile witness, although Mr. Hill intended to credit him for what he said.

Mr. *Hill* was heard in support of the question.

The *Committee* decided the question might be put.

10583. Now we will go to the 20 shares; you signed a year ago for the 20 shares; come, take care?—I believe you are mistaken; you do not know the railway at all.

10584. You paid 20 *l.* at Chatham-place, two months ago; is that true?—Yes, I believe it is.

10585. You are not sure of it; that has gone from you?—I believe it is; to the best of my recollection, it was two months ago I paid it; now you say it is a year ago.

10586. No, I do not; I do not say you paid anything; it is a year ago since you signed for 20 shares now, is it not?—No, not to my knowledge.

10587. When did you sign for it?—I do not know the time, I before stated that.

10588. Did you sign at the time you paid the money?—Yes, to the best of my belief.

10589. Cannot you say something exactly?—I cannot recollect, unless I saw the date upon the instrument.

10590. What are you; you call yourself of 8, Capel-court, Strand?—No, it is not Strand; it is S. E., Stock Exchange.

10591. What are you; you are of course a gentleman; but what else are you?—They designated me so there.

10592. Who are they that designated you?—The people who received my money for the shares; I said I was not in any business.

10593. Who was it designated you a gentleman?—I am not in business.

10594. Who put your name down as a gentleman, did you write it yourself?—Probably I did.

10595. Did any one tell you to write yourself down gentleman?—I was asked what business I was; I said none; and they said, put you down gentleman.

10596. In railway offices, a man who has no business is necessarily a gentleman; have you ever been in any business?—Yes.

10597. What business?—As an engineer.

10598. How long is it since you practised as an engineer?—Some years; an agricultural

William Cook.

28 April 1837.

agricultural engineer; a man who has done as much for my country as any one here.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

10599. Do you know your own handwriting when you see it [*handing a paper to the Witness*]; is that your letter?—Yes.

10600. Do you know what sum of money it was you paid for the shares, whether 20 *l.* or 40 *l.*?—I think it was 20 *l.*, but I never got these shares, to my recollection; these were not the 20 shares; I never got any.

10601. From where?—Messrs. Beetham; that is, my application for shares; but I believe I never got any at that time; the other 20 shares were paid up by my son.

10602. I want to know whether this is your handwriting?—Yes, it is; but I do not consider that I got those shares.

10603. Do you know when it was; is your memory at all accurate as to the time you received any shares?—No, I cannot tell you.

10604. Can you tell us when it was you received the second set of shares?—About two months ago I think the second set of shares were put into my hand, to pay up the further instalments; I suppose there had been 1 *l.* paid.

10605. By whom?—By my son.

10606. You say you suppose there had been 1 *l.* paid?—I do not recollect the deposit upon the shares.

10607. Look at that, and tell me if you know your son's handwriting [*handing a paper to the Witness*]?—That is not my handwriting, nor any relation of mine; it is Richard Cooke. [*Two other papers were handed to the Witness.*] These are both my writing, I believe.

10608. Are you able to tell us, from any memorandum you have at home, when you received these shares?—I do not know whether I can or not.

10609. Do you know whether you have paid 1 *l.* a share, or 2 *l.* a share, or what sum?—I believe it was 1 *l.* a share I paid upon the 20 shares.

10610. Do you know whether it was 1 *l.* or 2 *l.*?—I am persuaded it was 1 *l.*

10611. Whose money was it you paid it with?—I do not know; my son gave it me.

Re-examined by Mr. *Hill.*

10612. Have you got any shares?—No, I have not.

10613. Who sent you the shares; what did you mean by the answer to my learned friend; who sent you any shares?—I have got shares from different companies.

10614. Stick to this company; have you ever had any shares of this company sent to you?—Not that I know of.

10615. Have you ever had in your possession any shares of this company?—Yes; I had them in my hand for the purpose of paying them up.

10616. Who gave them to you?—My son.

10617. Did you give them back to him?—Yes.

10618. Are you able to pay these 4,000 *l.* for these 80 shares?—No.

10619. Four thousand pence could you pay?—No, not at this moment, if that will satisfy you.

[The Witness withdrew.

Sabbati, 29° die Aprilis, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Forster. | Mr. C. Lushington. | Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *William Winkworth*, called in; and Examined:

10617*. Mr. *Bircham.*] WHERE do you reside?—In Derby-street, King's Cross.

10618*. You have been employed in the investigation of the circumstances of some subscribers to the subscription deeds, of the South Midland?—Yes; only the South Midland.

10619*. Have you in consequence of those inquiries called on Joseph Dandridge?—Yes.

10620. Where does he reside?—102, Wood-street, Cheapside.

10621. Did you have any conversation with Dandridge with reference to his subscription?—Yes; I did with reference to the South Midland Company.

10622. With reference to shares generally?—With reference to shares generally he spoke to me.

10623. What did he tell you?—He told me he was a dealer in shares.

10624. For investment?—He bought them with the idea of disposing of them again.

10625. Did he state anything as to the amount?—He has dealt largely in shares of different kinds, and owing to an indisposition he had had for some weeks he had only 30 shares on hand; but he has dealt in shares in that way, even to dispose of them at one-eighth profit.

10626. *Chairman.*] One-eighth per cent.?—Yes.

10627. Mr. *Bircham.*] Did he ever tell you he bought shares for the purpose of holding them?—

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the question.
The question was waived.

10628. I will take you to Gustavus Edward Beckers; do you know that gentleman?—Yes, I do.

10629. Did you go to his residence?—I went to Mr. Beckering; it is the same person; he signed it. It is the same person; he signs his name Beckering in our railway.

10630. Where is his residence?—2, Hill-street, Walworth.

10631. Whom did you see there?—I did not see him, I saw his wife.

10632. What did you learn about him?—She told me that she believed he was a clerk on the Great Western Railway, at Box, near Bath.

10633. *Chairman.*] Did she say anything further?—He was now at Birmingham.

10634. What occupation?—She did not say in what occupation.

10635. Mr *Bircham.*] Did she state anything about his circumstances?—She said he was some time since a member of the Stock Exchange, and that owing to his speculations he had run through a great many thousands, and that at the present moment he was supported by the contributions of relations abroad, in Prussia, where he was going in a week or a fortnight's time, from the time she told me.

10636. Do you recollect anything else?—Mrs. Becker said she believed that he had

Mr. *Winkworth.*

29 April 1837.

had got rid of the whole of his shares, and added he had repeatedly failed in his speculations.

10637. She stated he was once a member of the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

10638. Did she state he was so now?—She did not say that; I did not ask her the question; I apprehended he was not, being a clerk at Box.

10639. Have you in the course of your inquiries called on John Jackson, in the third page?—Yes, I have.

10640. Have you seen Jackson?—14, Dorset-crescent, New North Road? I called; I did not see him, I saw Mrs. Jackson.

10641. Have you ever seen him?—No; I have called there two or three times and never been able to see him. Mrs. Jackson said that Mr. Jackson had lost a fortune by speculation.

10642. Did she state anything as to his present circumstances?—Not a word of it; she believed he had sold the shares.

10643. George Henry Randell, in the second page, three from the bottom, did you call upon him?—Yes, I did.

10644. Did you find him?—No.

10645. What was his address?—I went to a great many places for him; 6, Camberwell-green he has stated is his residence in the South Midland Railway.

10646. Did you inquire at any other place?—I called at those different places.

10647. What different places?—No. 6, Park-place; he was not there; and Park-buildings also.

10648. *Chairman.*] Here it is, 5, Park-road, Clapham-road?—I called there afterwards, and there was no such person to be met with; it took me almost a day to find it.

10649. Did you find him at last?—No.

10650. Mr. *Bircham.*] Have you found the same name with different residences on other deeds?—I should suppose it was the same.

10651. Have you called at all those places yourself?—I have, in reference to our railway.

10652. Having found the same name subscribed with a different address in different deeds, have you called at all those places?—Yes, I have.

10653. Have you been able to hear of him?—No; I found out one Randell; he had nothing to do with these shares; he was under-gardener to Mr. Cubitt.

10654. Where was this?—Clarence-road, in the neighbourhood of where the person called George Henry Randell puts his name, Park-road; but this does not appear to be the same name; John Randell is the person I found out.

10655. You mean that the gardener was not the same name?—Yes.

10656. Joseph Amadio, in the fourth page, did you call at his residence, 118, St. John-street Road?—I did.

10657. Did you find Joseph Amadio there?—I found the father there; but they have two shops, one is at 118, St. John-street-road, and the other, 18, Redcross-street.

10658. We are talking of the son?—I did not find him there.

10659. Did you seek for him elsewhere?—Yes.

10660. Did you inquire for him there?—Yes; they told me if I went to 18, Redcross-street, I should find him there.

10661. Did you find him there?—Yes.

10662. What did he say?—I asked him about our railway company, and the only answer I could get from him was, that the affair had ruined him; he was a very young man.

10663. Did he state to you anything about his circumstances generally?—No; I could not get anything more out of him.

10664. *Chairman.*] You say the affair had ruined him; what affair?—Yes; our South Midland Railway; he has got fifty shares in it.

10665. Mr. *Bircham.*] Have you had any communication with John Edward Stokes, page 2?—Yes.

10666. About his subscription for shares generally?—I had some conversation with Mr. Stokes; he told me he dealt largely in shares.

10667. Did he state anything as to his power of paying for them?—At the present moment? Either a partner or a person he had employed had speculated very largely,

largely, and the consequences to him would be, that his wife, he supposed, and his children, would be obliged to seek relief from friends, or in some other way; the person's name was Cooke.

10668. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Did he say his partner or that person had dealt largely in shares?—No; had made a speculation to the amount of 21,000 *l.* unknown to him; that he had never 2,000 *l.* stock out, and that he had used his name, and involved him in ruin, if such was the case.

10669. Mr. *Bircham.*] You are speaking of John Edward Stokes, Hemsley-terrace, Hackney?—No. 4, Bank Chambers, where I called upon him.

10670. Is he a broker?—Yes.

10671. What did he say?—He told me that the effect that this had upon him would eventually ruin him; it must; and that his family in consequence would be obliged to seek for relief somewhere or other.

10672. Have you seen Charles Frazer, page 3?—Yes, I have.

10673. What was the effect of your conversation with him relative to his circumstances and his power to pay?—In reference to our railway, I cannot speak to any other railway. As to Mr. Frazer, he is a clerk in a gas-light office in Abchurch-lane.

10674. That is a different man?—This is the same, 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road; he resides there; he is a clerk in the gas-light office in Abchurch-lane.

10675. *Chairman.*] Do you mean the shop where they sell fittings for gas?—No; it is a gas-light office to the Herne Bay Gas-light Company.

10676. Mr. *Clarkson.*] He is a clerk there?—Yes.

10677. *Chairman.*] Did you see the man?—I did; he said he was directed by a friend to subscribe his name to the Parliamentary deed with reference to our railway, and to take shares, with the understanding that his friend was to pay all calls, and he had done the same as to other railroads.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

10678. When were those inquiries of yours made?—About three weeks since.

10679. You were, I presume, then acting on the part of the South Midland Railway Company?—I was.

10680. In what capacity?—I was employed by Mr. Vane, of Carlton Chambers.

10681. To do what?—I was presented with this book with the names, and asked if I would go round and inquire as to their circumstances.

10682. Was that before the South Midland Railway Company had been before the Committee on the Standing Orders of the House of Commons?—I apprehend not; I do not know it.

10683. You do not know whether the Standing Orders Committee had voted the Standing Orders to have been complied with by the company at that time?—No, I knew nothing, but having a book given to me; I was a stranger in London entirely.

10684. Were you employed confidentially?—No, I apprehend not; because my evidence was to be brought before the public.

10685. By whom?—By the parties who employed Mr. Vane, or Mr. Vane himself.

10686. Who are the parties who employed Mr. Vane?—I believe Sir Henry Halford was one, in reference to some names on a petition he is going to present in the House of Commons against the railway, the South Midland.

10687. Have you seen Sir Henry upon the subject?—Never.

10688. How then do you know that Sir Henry was the person that employed Mr. Vane?—I could not say positively that it was him.

10689. Why do you suppose it was?—Because I have heard it intimated at Mr. Vane's.

10690. From whom?—From Mr. Vane.

10691. Who paid you?—I have not been paid at all yet.

10692. How are you to be paid, by the week, by the day, or by the success of the enterprise?—It matters to me very little how I am paid, as long as I am paid.

10693. Perhaps you will tell the Committee under what circumstances you were employed?—I am employed by Mr. Vane, and I shall expect to be paid by him.

10694. What is Mr. Vane?—A solicitor.

10695. Was

Mr. *Winkworth.*

29 April 1837.

10695. Was it in his general character of solicitor, or solicitor to any body in particular, you were employed?—I was employed by him as opposing the South Midland Railway.

10696. Opposing for whom?—That I was never told.

10697. Do you not know?—No, I do not.

10698. Try if you cannot tell us?—I would tell you anything I knew.

10699. Have you any reason to believe who he was employed by?—No, I have not.

10700. Has Mr. Vane anything to do with the Southampton Railway Company?—Nothing at all, I believe.

10701. Has Sir Henry Halford?—Nothing at all I believe; I am quite a stranger in London altogether.

10702. How came you to be brought here to give evidence in this case?——The facts were, I was introduced by Mr. Vane to Mr. Bircham, there having been one or two names on the City Railway deed I had been to.

10703. When was it you were introduced to Mr. Bircham?—About three weeks ago.

10704. In what capacity was Mr. Bircham acting then, as attorney for the Southampton Railway?—That I cannot tell; I was merely asked all I know about the parties, and what was the answer I had received.

10705. Did you know from Mr. Bircham, at the time, he was a petitioner to this honourable Committee?—I did not at that time.

10706. Did you know he had prepared a petition from Mr. Lill, which he afterwards disclaimed, and said was not approved by him?—No.

10707. Do you know that Mr. Lill stated, that, under the misrepresentations made to him by Mr. Bircham, he had given instructions to prepare a petition, which he afterwards wished to withdraw?—No, I do not; I have never seen Mr. Bircham but twice.

10708. Who is to pay you?—I suppose Mr. Bircham.

10709. Were your inquiries directed solely and exclusively to the South Midland Company?—Yes, except such as Dandridge, who told me that he was a dealer in other shares.

10710. Your object was to inquire exclusively relative to the South Midland?—Yes.

10711. Have you any knowledge whatever of the practices of persons formed into companies heretofore on the subject of subscription lists?—Nothing at all; I am a stranger to it.

10712. Have you experience enough in the world to tell us whether share-brokers, or what has been termed share-hunters, is a common avocation in life?—I cannot speak positively to that; I rather think it is; and Dandridge gave me that evidence that he dealt largely in shares, and sold them at half-a-crown profit; that is evidence of it.

10713. Your experience does not go far back?—No, I am quite a stranger to London; I do not know the stockbrokers.

10714. Were you brought from the country to go into this inquiry?—No, I am living in London.

10715. What pursuit were you following before?—None.

10716. In the course of your inquiries upon this subject did you see a person of the name of Green?—Yes, I met him at Mr. Vane's.

10717. Was it before or after you were introduced to Mr. Bircham?—Before.

10718. Did he present himself as a clerk of Mr Bircham?—No, not in any character.

10719. Did you meet him there by accident?—Yes; but Mr. Vane informed me there were parties getting up the same evidence as myself; that he thought my word would be taken rather than theirs; as I was a stranger in London, and did not know any of the parties, I should have no interest in stating what was not true.

10720. You not having been a share-runner or share-jobber?—No; I am no share-jobber.

10721. Are you a holder of shares?—Yes, I am; but mine were bought down in the country; I only hold four.

10722. How long have you been a share-holder?—A twelvemonth.

10723. May I take the liberty of asking how many?—Four.

10724. What company?—The Grand Connexion.

10725. I do

10725. I do not know whether your possession of the four shares will enable you to explain to us what the Grand Connexion Company means?—The Grand Connexion Railway Company.

10726. To what amount in value are those four shares?—Fifty pounds a share.

10727. Are you yourself a man of any property?—I am.

10728. Have you ever been the holder of more than four?—Never.

10729. Did you purchase them before the company was formed?—No; I purchased them in the country, but I gave a large premium for them.

10730. You bought them in the market?—No; I bought them of a friend.

10731. You have not subscribed the deed?—No.

10732. When you were introduced to Mr. Bircham, did you learn from him he was the attorney of the Southampton Company, and opposing the bill in that capacity?—I learnt nothing of the kind; I was only given, by Mr. Pain, a list of subscribers, and I was told to show it to Mr. Bircham, and he would give me instructions.

10733. And then those six persons were persons, amongst a variety of others, upon whom you called for the purpose of making inquiries as to their possession of shares in the South Midland Railway?—Yes.

10734. And in the course of this inquiry some circumstances you have stated transpired with reference to their general possession of shares?—Yes.

10735. Will you be so good as to repeat what you said passed between you and Mr. Stokes?—I state that Mr. Stokes told me, at the present moment I was speaking to him, that a person of the name of Cooke had speculated in his name to the amount of 21,000 *l.* stock, and that it would involve him in ruin, owing to his so doing; that he had never had 2,000 *l.* stock out in his life.

10736. Then, if I understand you rightly, Mr. Stokes's representation of the state of his present circumstances was with reference to a transaction that had been conducted in his name, of which at the time he was totally unaware?—Yes.

10737. And that he had become incidentally ruined by reason of that transaction?—Yes.

10738. Did you pursue your inquiry to ascertain Mr. Stokes's means in the event of that speculation not having been made?—No; I did not.

10739. *Chairman.*] Mr. Stokes said he was never possessed of more than 2,000 *l.* stock out in his life?—Yes.

10740. Mr. *Clarkson.*] That he never himself had more than 2,000 *l.* stock in his life?—Yes; "out," he said.

10741. Your inquiries did not extend to his other means?—No.

10742. But in consequence of a transaction in which his name had been used, he found himself involved in difficulty?—Yes.

10743. Now you speak of Mrs. Jackson, that she told you that her husband had lost a fortune by speculations?—Yes.

10744. Did you pursue your inquiry into what speculations, and under what circumstances, and at what time they took place?—No.

10745. As to your general inquiries, you represent some to have stated that they were dealers in shares?—Yes.

10746. Did you pursue your inquiry into their means or capacities to meet their engagements?—No, I did not; in some of them ocular demonstration was quite sufficient. Dandridge keeps a very small barber's shop at 102, Wood-street.

10747. Will you tell me how a gentleman lately from the country can tell what a barber's means are by looking at his shop?—No; but the shop was very small.

10748. But you did not pursue your inquiry?—No, I did not.

10749. As to Randell, you could not find him anywhere?—No.

10750. And with regard to Amadio, the son, you say he represented that his transactions with the South Midland, whatever they were, had ruined him?—Yes.

10751. Did you ascertain from him when those transactions had originated?—No, I did not.

10752. Did you ascertain what his circumstances were previously to those transactions?—No, I did not.

10753. With reference to Mr. Frazer, you say he was clerk at a gas-light office for the Herne Bay Company?—Yes.

10754. Did you pursue any inquiries with regard to his means at all?—No, I did not.

THE REFORM LIBRARY

Mr. *Winkworth.*

29 April 1837.

Re-examined by Mr. *Bircham.*

10755. You have been asked when your inquiries were first made by order of Mr. Vane, and whether they were before or after the Standing Orders were passed; do you know at what stage of the Bill they are passed?—No, I do not; I know nothing at all about it.

10756. And your general knowledge of the circumstances enables you to come to that conclusion as to Dandridge, although you have not lived in town?—Merely the appearance of the shop; the appearance of the shop would enable me to say, that the man was not worth thirty or forty thousand pounds; I cannot say whether he was worth 100 *l.* or 500*l.*; but he was not worth 20,000 *l.*

10757. You say your inquiries were confined to the South Midland; but were not they, as to their present circumstances, to ascertain whether they could pay the subscriptions?—I was to make general inquiries as to their means, and so forth; I did not press the inquiry into their circumstances.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Daniel Edward Stevens,* called in; and Examined.

Mr. *D. E. Stevens.*

10758. Mr. *Bircham.*] WHERE do you reside?—Chingford, in Essex.

10759. Do you know Gustavus Edward Beckers?—Yes.

10760. Where does he reside?—2, Hill-street, Walworth.

10761. Can you state to the Committee what the present circumstances of Beckers are?—That he is in very poor and distressed circumstances I know of my own knowledge.

10762. Mr. *Lushington.*] Beckers and Burkers; are they the same?—Yes, and Beckering.

10763. Mr. *Bircham.*] Have you any particular circumstances you can state to the Committee as to him?—I hold a dishonoured acceptance of his to the amount of 40*l.* over-due five years, and have often asked him to pay it by instalments of 5*s.* or 10*s.* a month, and on each and every occasion he has declared his inability to do anything of the kind, but was in hopes he should get into some good employment by which he should be enabled to do it.

10764. When did you see him last?—I have not seen him these four months; he was then about to be engaged, he told me, as a clerk in some railroad office near Bath, the Great Western Railway; that 35*s.* a week he expected to get as a remuneration for his services.

10765. You know him as residing at 2, Hill-street, Walworth?—I have been there; his family reside there.

10766. Jacob Nunes Castello?—Yes.

10767. Where does he reside?—He resides in the free houses in Cock-court, Jewin-street, in the city of London.

10768. Do you know whether this is the same person who was concerned in the Kent Railway?—Yes, I do; in the Deptford and Dover; he procured the parties to sign the deed.

10769. Can you give the Committee any circumstances that will enable them to judge of Mr. Castello's circumstances at the present time?—That he is indebted to me in a sum of between thirty and forty pounds, and has always stated he was quite unable to pay me.

10770. When did you see him last?—I saw him in this committee-room yesterday, if I am not mistaken.

10771. When had you any conversation with him as to his circumstances?—The 14th or 17th of February last, when I asked him for something on account; at that time he was paying the subscribers to the Deptford and Dover Railway deed; he said he was unable to pay me anything; that what he received from the parties he required to take home to his family; but if it was in his power at a future time, he should be most happy to do it; and should he at any time earn 25*l.*, he then would give me 5*s.* on account, but it was the first duty of a man to take something home for the support of his family.

10772. Do you know where he is now residing?—In No. 3, Cock-court, Jewry-street. I understand in the free houses, which are the almshouses belonging to the Jews' synagogue.

10773. Have you had any application made to you on behalf of Castello recently?—No; I have a letter in my possession where he applied to a person in Mile-end Old Town for a character, touching his conduct in the Deptford and Dover Railway, and the parties refused to have anything to do with him.

10774. Do

Mr. *D. E. Stevens.*

29 April 1837.

10774. Do you know Henry Gunston?—I know him by sight; I have spoken to him three or four times.

10775. Do you know his residence?—No, I do not; except the present one, that is in Whitecross-street.

10776. What part of the street?—The prison.

10777. Have you seen him there?—Yes.

10778. Have you had a communication with him there as to this railway?—Nothing more than giving him to understand that he would be required to attend here and give evidence. Previous to that I had some conversation with him about some shares which I was given to understand by him were the property of Mr. Beckers, and for which he had signed the deed.

10779. In this railway?—Yes; what led to it was from a conversation with Mr. Baker himself on Westminster Bridge, who stated that Gunston had signed the deed for him.

10780. *Chairman.*] Who is Baker?—He keeps the Auction Mart coffeehouse and tavern.

10781. Mr. *Bircham.*] Then did Gunston corroborate Baker?—He declined answering the question.

10782. Did he admit he had signed this deed?—He stated he had signed this deed.

10783. Do you know Francis Drake?—I was introduced to him, and went to see him in Whitecross-street prison.

10784. You do not know where his previous residence was?—107, Stamford-street.

10785. *Chairman.*] When did you see him in Whitecross-street prison?—It is about three weeks since; both Gunston and him were together.

10786. Did anything take place with reference to his subscription?—He said he had signed the deed and paid the deposits, but did not hold any of the shares; he added, he was a speculator in shares; that he was then in prison upon a bill of exchange for 750*l.* for shares which he had purchased at Manchester, and there was also another bill for the same amount he had accepted for shares at the same place, and expected to be sued upon that also.

10787. Anything further?—Nothing further.

10788. Do you know William Bloxam?—Yes; William Burnett Bloxam; I know him.

10789. How long have you known him?—About twelve months or sixteen months.

10790. Where did he reside?—96, Park-street, he did reside; he does not now.

10791. *Chairman.*] Park-street, where?—In the western part of London, near the Regent's Park.

10792. Mr. *Bircham.*] Do you know his handwriting?—No.

10793. Did you ever see him with regard to this deed?—No.

10794. Do you know anything of his circumstances?—I cannot say I know much of his circumstances, otherwise than he has subscribed several other deeds.

10795. You have never had any communication with him?—Not upon business.

10796. When did you see him last?—Six or eight months since I saw him last, at least that.

10797. Will you state what took place as to his subscription of other deeds?—He told me he was in the habit of getting letters of appropriation to such companies as would pay him; and he sometimes wrote in his own name, William Burnett Bloxam, and William Bloxam, and sometimes William Burnett; he thought he had a right to assume the name of Burnett, his uncle Burnett being a distiller at Vauxhall; and if he thought he could do any good in getting shares upon his terms, he would not mind asking all the common girls on the town, (he used another word,) to write for them, as well as gentlemen's butlers. I see he has signed the South Midland Counties Railway for 140 shares; "William Bloxam 7,000 *l.*"

10798. You mean a person of the same name living in the same place?—W. Bloxam, gentleman, and W. Burnett, 96, Park-street, Regent's Park, Esquire, signed the Chester and Crewe for 500 *l.*; W. B. Bloxam, of 40, Broad-street-buildings, wine-merchant, London, signed the London, Shoreham and Brighton for 500 *l.*; and I believe them all to be one and the same person.

10799. Do you know William Hall, page 3, London-road, Southwark?—I know him personally.

 10800. Have

Mr. *D.E. Stevens.*

29 April 1837.

10800. Have you had any communication with him in reference to this rail way?—Yes, I have; he admitted he had signed the deed; he did not hold the shares at present; that he dealt largely in shares, and had signed a great many other deeds.

10801. Has he any other residence?—He describes himself of 8, Capel-court, and sometimes London-road, Southwark, and sometimes Mount Nod Cottage, Streatham, Surrey.

10802. Have you ascertained that the William Hall who describes himself of Mount Nod Cottage, Streatham, is the same person as he of 18, London-road, Southwark?—Yes, from the interview I had with him; but the person is present who had an interview with him.

10803. Henry Collinson?—I have him; 17, Bedford-place, Russell-square; 25 shares.

10804. Have you called there?—Yes; there is no such person as Henry Collinson of 17, Bedford-place, or 17, Upper Bedford-place; a Mr. Collinson lives at No. 52, the only name I could approach in Upper Bedford-place; and in 47, Guildford-street, a Mr. Brown Collinson resides there, but does not know anything of Henry; and through the postmen and tradespeople in the neighbourhood I could not find out any such person as Henry Collinson.

10805. Did you inquire at the house?—Yes, I did; and at every one of the 17's in the immediate neighbourhood.

10806. Did you inquire in the Commercial-road, Russell-place?—Yes; and Mile-end Old Town.

10807. With what success?—No such person known there.

10808. Frederick Langley; did you ever meet this gentleman?—I met him in the Poultry; an appointment was made for 12 o'clock, in the Poultry.

10809. Did you go there?—Yes.

10810. In company with whom?—With Mr. Green, and found him; it was a billiard-table.

10811. Who did you find there?—Upon first going into the room, three persons were in the subscribers' room, the coffee-room. I inquired for Mr. Frederick Langley, and the individual himself, who turned out to be Frederick Langley, said he is not here, he is gone, or words to that effect; he is not here; he drew us out of the room, after telling him we had an appointment at 12 o'clock upon the subject of the City Railway; he said, "The fact is, I am in difficulties, and I will be very candid with you; I will tell you all the particulars if you will be equally candid with me, and tell me how you found me out, or how you traced me;" he said he had put his name to bills to a large amount, and expected to be arrested upon them, and was obliged to use this precaution, and begged to know how we had found him out; we told him we had traced him entirely through a person who had removed his goods.

10812. From where?—From his place of abode.

10813. Do you know whether the place you traced him from is according to the printed subscription list?—Yes, it is.

10814. No. 4, Taunton-place, Regent's Park?—Yes.

10815. Do you remember where you traced him to?—I have written it down on the paper, I know.

10816. What further passed?—He said he had signed the deed, and he had paid the deposits, to the best of my recollection.

10817. You made a memorandum at the time which you have not got?—Yes, and I cannot state further from memory; I would prefer referring to the memorandum I made at the time.

10818. Did you call on Joseph Henam?—No, I did not.

10819. John Dickenson?—No.

[*A memorandum was handed to the Witness.*]

10820. Mr. *Bircham.*] Is that the memorandum of what passed with Langley?—Yes.

10821. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Is that a memorandum of your own?—The handwriting is mine, and Mr. Green's too.

10822. Mr. *Bircham.*] Is there anything material in it?—Merely tracing him from 4, Taunton-place, Regent's Park, to 54, George-street, Hampstead-road.

Mr.

Mr. *Clarkson* requested to be allowed to postpone the cross-examination of this witness till inquiries had been made. Mr. *D. E. Stevens.* 29 April 1837.

10823. Mr. *Forster.*] What is the actual profession of William Bloxam?—I am not at all aware; I traced him about a week since to a house up in Bond-street, with his brother, who keeps a house in the neighbourhood.

10824. Do you know whether he is, or is not, a wine-merchant?—No, he is not; his brother is a respectable man in Broad-street.

10825. He is not a wine-merchant?—No.

10826. Do you know of your own knowledge whether Francis Drake has ever resided in 107, Stamford-street?—No, I do not.

10827. You said he did?—Only from my understanding; he was in Whitecross-street prison; I went there direct to him, and saw him in the prison.

10828. By whom have you been employed in making the inquiries you have made?—By Mr. Bircham.

10829. Mr. *Bircham.*] Do you know William Dorrington?—Yes.

10830. Of Harleyford-street, Kennington Common?—Yes.

10831. How long have you known him?—About two years and a half, or three years.

10832. What is his occupation?—I know nothing of the man further than being a clerk to a person of the name of Stewart on the Stock Exchange, and * * * * *

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the line of examination, as being irrelevant and ruinous in point of expense to the party opposing the petition.

The Committee decided that the line of examination was relevant.

10834. Mr. *Bircham.*] Do you know anything further of Mr. Dorrington?—No, I do not.

Mr. *Joseph Beaumont,* called in; and Examined.

10835. Mr. *Bircham.*] WHERE do you reside?—No. 11, Finch-lane. Mr. *J. Beaumont.*

10836. Do you know Charles John Blunt, the engineer to this company?—Yes.

10837. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes, I do. [*The Deed was produced and shown to the Witness.*] This is the father's handwriting, not the son's.

10838. Charles Blunt, is that the father or the son?—The father.

10839. The father of the engineer?—Yes.

10840. Do you know him?—Yes.

10841. Do you know anything of his circumstances?—He took the benefit of the Insolvent Act last August; he was in prison at my suit.

10842. The man who has signed that deed?—Yes.

10843. Do you know his correct name?—His correct name is Charles Fly Blunt.

10844. You say he took the benefit of the Insolvent Debtors Act?—Yes, he was discharged last August; I saw him discharged, I opposed his discharge.

10845. Do you know Charles John Blunt, the son?—Yes, I am his assignee; he is an uncertificated bankrupt.

10846. Do you state that of your own knowledge?—Yes.

10847. You are his assignee?—Yes.

10848. Do you know Felix Blunt?—Yes.

10849. Do you know his age?—When examined at the Insolvent Debtors' Court, he was under age, in August last.

10850. Will you look at the deed?—

[*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*]

10851. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes.

10852. *Chairman.*] Here is Charles Blunt, Dartford, Kent, engineer?—That is the father; this signature to the deed is the writing of Felix Blunt.

10853. In August last, Felix Blunt stated himself to be under age?—Yes.

10854. Do you know to what extent?—It was not said.

Mr. *J. Beaumont.*

29 April 1837.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

10855. What may you be yourself?—A tailor.

10856. Anything else?—I ship goods occasionally, when I get an order from abroad.

10857. Anything else?—No.

10858. Nothing else?—Nothing.

10859. How long have you been a tailor?—In business for myself?

10860. Yes, as a tailor.—Nine years, nearly.

10861. Do you keep any shop?—I have the upper part of a house.

10862. Do you keep any shop?—None whatever.

10863. Where is the upper part of the house?—I have already given the address, 11, Finch-lane.

10864. Do you carry on business as a tailor there?—Yes.

10865. You make clothes there?—Yes, certainly.

10866. You are assignee to one of these persons, and opposed the other?—Yes, I did.

10867. Have you had any misfortunes of your own?—I have been a bankrupt, five years ago, and I have paid 17 *s.* in the pound.

10868. Any other misfortune?—None whatever, except the acquaintance of the Messrs. Blunt.

10869. When did you first know them?—By their getting into my debt.

10870. As a tailor?—Yes.

10871. How long ago was that?—It is seven years ago, I think.

10872. Have you ever been in prison yourself?—No.

10873. Never?—Never.

10874. You have been a tailor for nine years?—Yes.

10875. Had you followed any other business before that?—No.

10876. Where were you living before you went into business?—I was learning the business.

10877. You were an apprentice?—No, I was not.

10878. Have you never been an apprentice?—No; it is not unusual for a man to enter that business without being an apprentice.

10879. You learnt the business as a journeyman?—No, I never learnt to sew. When I left school I went to Mr. Nugee, in Bond-street, and learnt the business there.

10880. Did you receive wages there?—Yes, the latter part of the time.

10881. *Chairman.*] Is Charles Blunt, the father, an engineer, to your knowledge?—Yes; I believe he has the reputation of being an engineer; he has always stated so.

10882. Mr. *Forster.*] Is Felix Blunt an architect?—I do not know, he is a lad; I have seen him in his father's house, and I know him by having made things for him by his father's order.

10883. Mr. *Clarkson.*] When were you asked to come here?—Six or seven weeks ago.

10884. By whom?—A gentleman called on me.

10885. Who was it?—I do not see him here; I think he is a clerk to Mr. Bircham.

10886. Was his name Green?—I do not know his name; I could identify him if I saw him.

Re-examined by Mr. *Bircham.*

10887. You have been asked whether you were a bankrupt; you paid a dividend of 17 *s.* in the pound?—Yes, very near to that.

10888. Did you obtain your certificate?—The week after I passed my examination. I lost 3,000 *l.* by my partner.

Mr. *William Yewings*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *William Yewings.*

10889. Mr. *Bircham.*] WHAT is your occupation?—I am a clerk in Messrs. Few & Company's office.

10890. *Chairman.*] In Covent-garden?—Yes.

10891. Mr. *Bircham.*] You called upon the last witness, Mr. Beaumont?—Yes, I did, this morning.

10892. For

Mr. *William Yewings.*

29 April 1837.

10892. For what reason, in the first instance?—On my seeing his name in Mr. Blunt's schedule; he was a creditor in Mr. Blunt's schedule, which induced me to call upon him.

10893. What do you mean by Mr. Blunt's schedule?—In the Insolvent Court; I went to examine it there, and saw his name.

10894. *Chairman.*] What Mr. Blunt?—Charles Blunt, otherwise Charles Fly Blunt.

10895. Mr. *Bircham.*] What was the object of your calling upon Mr. Beaumont?—To identify Mr. Blunt, and to ascertain if he could give me any information as to his occupation.

10896. Have you searched in the Bankrupt Office in the name of Charles John Blunt?—Yes, I did.

10897. Did you find any adjudication?—Yes; an adjudication against Charles John Blunt and one Robert Stephenson; I think the christian name was Robert; they were partners as engineers.

10898. Did Mr. Beaumont identify him with Charles Blunt the son, the engineer, in your conversation with him; was it in consequence of the information that Mr. Beaumont gave you of the date of Charles John Blunt's bankruptcy you went to the Bankrupt Office, and found him a bankrupt?—I did not receive the date from him.

10899. *Chairman.*] Did you search at the Bankrupt Office, and find that Charles John Blunt, together with Robert Stephenson, were bankrupts?—Yes.

10900. What was the date of the bankruptcy?—I think it was in 1835 or 1834; but I am not certain.

10901. Mr. *Bircham.*] Assuming the date to be 1834 or 1835, did you search from that time to the present to ascertain if he had obtained his certificate?—Yes, I did.

10902. What was the result?—I found the certificate of Mr. Stephenson, but none of Mr. Blunt.

10903. Have you made inquiry as to the amount of the dividend that was paid under that commission?—I made inquiry, but I could not ascertain; they could not give me the information.

10904. You also searched at the Insolvent Debtors' Court for the name of John Lymburne Crawford?—Yes, I did.

10905. Did you find that name?—Yes.

10906. In what court; what is that paper you hold in your hand?—This is an official extract from the Insolvent Court, containing the description and extracts from the schedule.

10907. Read the extract from the schedule?—The extract is: "April 16th. Received proceeds on the sale of 20 City Railway shares, 30*l.*" This was on the debtor side; then, on the same side, "I this day purchased 20 shares in the City Railway Company, for 40*l.*;" and on the other side, "April 13th. Paid on the purchase of 20 City Railway shares 40*l.*;" and April the 14th, "I this day sold the 20 shares mentioned per contra, 30*l.*, with which I have debited myself in the foregoing part of this account, 30*l.* (signed) John Lymburne Crawford." He is described here as of Nottingham-place, New-road, amongst other residences.

10908. Read the description in full?—His residence is at Nottingham-place, and the office in Threadneedle-street, at that time.

10909. Did you inquire at 88, Fleet-street, as to the residence of William Edward Tekusche?—Yes; I did.

10910. What did you hear of Tekusche?—There is no such person known, it is spelt Tecknoche; that is the way it is mentioned here in the list.

10911. Who are the present occupiers?—I do not recollect the name, it is a silversmith's shop.

10912. These persons have resided there some time?—Yes.

10913. They so stated to you?—Yes.

10914. Tekusche did not reside there?—No.

10915. They did not know the name?—No.

10916. Did you inquire of Arthur George Wilson, 131, Chancery-lane?—Yes, I did.

10917. What did you hear of him?—He had lodged there on the second floor; but he left there about Christmas, unknowingly to the landlord.

10918. Did the landlord know where he was now?—No; he said he wished he did know.

Mr. *William Yewings.*

29 April 1837.

10919. *Chairman.*] When you say left unknowingly to the landlord, what do you mean?—He left in a clandestine way.

10920. Did he leave his rent unpaid?—Yes, he did.

10921. Mr. *Bircham.*] Did you call on Henry Cooper, 8, Thomas-street, Borough?—Yes; I called there.

10922. Did you find him there?—No; he had lodged there, but he had gone away.

10923. Could they give you any clue to him?—No, they could not. I saw the landlady.

10924. *Chairman.*] Had he left anything unpaid?—No, he had not; I did not learn anything of that kind; it was Thomas-street East.

10925. Mr. *Bircham.*] In the Borough?—Yes.

10926. Charles Griffith, did you call on him, 9, Myrtle-street, Hoxton?—Yes, I called there; he had lodged there, but had left, and they did not know where.

10927. John Jeremy?—Yes; 27, Falcon-square; I inquired.

10928. In consequence of what did you call there?—I was requested to do so by yourself; you said there was a reference there.

10929. Did you find him there?—No; he was in the habit of having letters addressed there to him; they have known him only a few days.

10930. Did they know where he was?—No.

10931. How did they send the letters to him?—He called for them occasionally; he did not live there.

10932. John Simes, No. 1, Hatton-wall, victualler; did you call there?—Yes; the house was shut up, he had left; I was told he had gone away, nobody knew where, in consequence of certain penalties.

10933. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Who told you this?—A neighbour.

10934. Mr. *Bircham.*] Was there any one in the house?—No; it was shut up.

10935. *Chairman.*] Where did you inquire?—I learnt it of a neighbour.

10936. Of what neighbour?—A shop opposite; it is a corner house; I inquired there; I think it was a butter-shop; I went into the first shop I saw open.

10937. Do you remember the name of the person that keeps it?—No; I inquired if Symes lived there formerly, and they said he had; I then inquired if they could tell me where he was to be found, and they said they could not, that he had left; he had heard——

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the evidence, as being a statement not made by any party at the house of the party inquired about, the point having been already decided by this Committee on the objection of Mr. Thesiger.

The Committee decided that the evidence might be taken for what it was worth.

Witness.] I was also told there was an advertisement put into the paper for him.

10938. At the same butter-shop?—Yes.

10939. Was this close upon the spot?—Only across the street, about 10 yards; it was the first place I could see to inquire at.

10940. Henry Laxton; did you search as to that name in the Insolvent Debtors' Court?—Yes.

10941. You had an adjudication?—Yes, I have.

[*The Witness delivered in the following Paper:*]

Order of Adjudication forthwith. (L. S.) } Pursuant to the Act for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors in England.

The Court for Relief of Insolvent Debtors, on the 11th day of March 1829.

In the matter of the petition of Henry Laxton, late of 2, Bedford-place, Kennington, Surrey, Architect and Surveyor, a prisoner in the King's Bench Prison.

Upon hearing the matters of the petition and schedule of the said prisoner, and upon examination made into the same, and upon the said prisoner's swearing to the truth of the same, and executing a warrant of attorney in pursuance of the said Act; It is adjudged and ordered, that the said prisoner shall be discharged from custody, and entitled to the benefit of the said Act forthwith, as to the several debts and sums of money due or claimed to be due on the 31st day of January 1829, being the time of filing the said petition, from the said prisoner to the several persons named in the said schedule as creditors, or claiming to be creditors for the same respectively, or for which such persons gave credit to the said prisoner before the said time of filing the said petition, and which were not then payable, and as to the

the claims of all other persons not now known to the said prisoner, who may be indorsees or holders of any negotiable security set forth in the said schedule so sworn to as aforesaid.

By the Court.

I hereby certify this to be a true copy of the original adjudication of Henry Laxton.

E. R. Sturgis,
Deputy to John Massey, Chief Clerk
(L. S.) of this Court, in whose custody such adjudication is. —12/4/37.

10942. James M'Carthy, did you search as to him?—Yes.

10943. Do you produce the certified adjudication as to him?—Yes.

10944. What is he described as?—Late of 11, Crutched-friars, London, general agent and merchant.

10945. Have you inquired at 11, Crutched-friars, as to his residence?—No; I have not inquired at No. 11.

10946. Have you made any inquiries to find whether James M'Carthy now lives there?—No, I have not; I have been into Crutched-friars, but could not find him there.

10947. Did you go to the residence described in the share list?—Yes; Beaumont-square, Mile-end.

10948. Could you learn where he had come from there?—I did not learn in the house, but I learnt from a person in the square he lived at Mile-end or Whitechapel, at Purim-place.

10949-50. Did you trace him back to Crutched-friars?—In his schedule I saw that his residence was stated to have been in Purim-place, and his house at Crutched-friars.

10951. Did you find on inquiry at Beaumont-square he had come from Purim-place?—Yes; I went down to endeavour to trace him.

10952. Did you inquire at the house?—Yes, I did; but other parties were living there.

10953. Did they tell you where he had come from?—No, they did not.

10954. Did you hear anything of him at that place?—No, they did not know anything of him. I inquired at a shop in the square, and they told me he came from Purim-place, and had gone by several names, and left without paying his rent, as he had in the former house.

10955. Did you learn there what his occupation was?—No; they did not know anything of him.

[*The Witness delivered in the following Paper:*]

Order of Adjudication forthwith. } Pursuant to the Act for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors in England. The Court for Relief of Insolvent Debtors, on the 8th day of July 1831. In the matter of the petition of James M'Carthy, late of 11, Crutched-friars, London, general agent and merchant, a prisoner in the debtors' prison for London and Middlesex. Upon hearing the matters of the petition and schedule of the said prisoner, and upon examination made into the same, and upon the said prisoner's swearing to the truth of the same, and executing a warrant of attorney in pursuance of the said Act; It is adjudged and ordered, that the said prisoner shall be discharged from custody, and entitled to the benefit of the said Act forthwith, as to the several debts and sums of money due or claimed to be due on the 2d day of October 1830, being the time of filing the said petition, from the said prisoner to the several persons named in the said schedule as creditors or claiming to be creditors for the same respectively, or for which such persons gave credit to the said prisoner before the said time of filing the said petition, and which were not then payable, and as to the claims of all other persons, not now known to the said prisoner, who may be indorsees or holders of any negotiable security set forth in the said schedule so sworn to as aforesaid.

By the Court.

I hereby certify this to be a true copy of the original adjudication of James M'Carthy.

(signed) *E. R. Sturgis,*
Deputy to John Massey, Chief Clerk of this Court, in whose custody such adjudication is.—12/4/37.

10956. Did you inquire at 20, Baker-street, Pentonville, for John Reid, the last name on the third page?—Yes, I did; he was a lodger there.

10957. Could they tell you where he now lived?—No, they did not know

Mr. *William Yewings.*

29 April 1837.

where he lived; they believed he was a clerk in a house in the City, but they could not tell me the exact house, or the firm.

10958. Did you search in the Insolvent Debtors' Court for the name of Henry Sibley.—Yes.

10959. Have you any official document relating to him?—I have the certified copy of adjudication as to him also.

[*The Witness delivered in the following Paper:*]

Order of Adjudication forthwith. Pursuant to the Act for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors in England. The Court for Relief of Insolvent Debtors on the thirteenth day of November 1832. In the matter of the petition of Henry Sibley, late of No. 24, Westmoreland-place, Middlesex, attorney's clerk, a prisoner in the Fleet Prison. Upon hearing the matters of the petition and schedule of the said prisoner, and upon examination made into the same, and upon the said prisoner's swearing to the truth of the same, and executing a warrant of attorney in pursuance of the said Act; It is adjudged and ordered, that the said prisoner shall be discharged from custody, and entitled to the benefit of the said Act forthwith, as to the several debts and sums of money due or claimed to be due on the 5th day of September 1832, being the time of filing the said petition, from the said prisoner to the several persons named in the said schedule as creditors or claiming to be creditors for the same respectively, or for which such persons gave credit to the said prisoner before the said time of filing the said petition, and which were not then payable, and as to the claims of all other persons, not now known to the said prisoner, who may be indorsees or holders of any negotiable security set forth in the said schedule so sworn to as aforesaid.

By the Court.

I hereby certify this to be a true copy of the original adjudication of Henry Sibley.

E. R. Sturgis,
Deputy to John Massey, Chief Clerk of this Court, in whose custody such document is.—12/4/37.

10960. Have you any more adjudications?—Yes; John Edward Stokes and John Lymburner Crawford.

[*The Witness delivered in the following Papers:*]

Order of Adjudication forthwith. Pursuant to the Act for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors in England. The Court for Relief of Insolvent Debtors, on the 11th day of March 1834. In the matter of the petition of John Edward Stokes, late of 8, Newmarket-terrace, Hackney-road, Middlesex, stock-jobber and broker, a prisoner in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex. Upon hearing the matters of the petition and schedule of the said prisoner, and upon examination made into the same, and upon the said prisoner swearing to the truth of the same, and executing a warrant of attorney in pursuance of the said Act; It is adjudged and ordered, that the said prisoner shall be discharged from custody, and entitled to the benefit of the said Act forthwith, as to the several debts and sums of money due or claimed to be due on the 18th day of January 1834, being the time of filing the said petition, from the said prisoner to the several persons named in the said schedule as creditors or claiming to be creditors for the same respectively, or for which such persons gave credit to the said prisoner before the said time of filing the said petition, and which were not then payable, and as to the claims of all other persons, not now known to the said prisoner, who may be indorsees or holders of any negotiable security set forth in the said schedule so sworn to as aforesaid.

By the Court.

I hereby certify this to be a true copy of the original adjudication of John Edward Stokes.

E. R. Sturgis,
Deputy to John Massey, Chief Clerk of this Court, in whose custody such adjudication is.—12/4/37.

Pursuant to the Act for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors in England. The Court for Relief of Insolvent Debtors, on the 15th day of July, 1836. In the matter of the petition of John Lymburner Crawford, late of 6, Nottingham-place, New-road, Middlesex, merchant, a prisoner in the Fleet Prison. Upon hearing the matters of the petition and schedule of the said prisoner, and upon examination made into the same, and upon the said prisoner's swearing to the truth of the same, and executing a warrant of attorney in pursuance of the said Act; It was adjudged and ordered, that the said prisoner shall be discharged from custody, and entitled to the benefit of the said Act forthwith, as to the several debts and sums of money due or claimed to be due on the 1st day of June 1836, being the time of filing the said petition, from the said prisoner to the several persons named in the said schedule as creditors or claiming to be creditors for the same respectively, or for which such persons gave credit to the said prisoner before the said time of filing the said petition, and which were not then payable, and as to the claims of all other persons, not now known to the said

said prisoner, who may be indorsees or holders of any negotiable security set forth in the said schedule so sworn to as aforesaid.

By the Court.

I hereby certify this to be a true copy of the original adjudication of John Lymburner Crawford.

E. R. Sturgis,
Deputy to John Massey, Chief Clerk of this Court, in whose custody such adjudication is.—12/4/37.

Mr. *William Yevings.*

29 April 1837.

10961. Did you call on Edward Brenan?—Yes; he is described as 41, High Holborn: he is in the habit of frequenting there; it is a coffeehouse.

10962. He did not reside there?—No; he had not been there four or five months.

10963. Did they know his then residence at the time he used to frequent there?—No. Then I have Charles Gould, described at 67, King-street, Golden-square. No such person known there; the present occupier has lived there thirteen years.

10964. Charles Manby, 1, Salisbury-street, Strand?—The name was not known there.

10965. James Railton?—I went to Queen-street, and it was a chandler's shop kept; Jane Railton over the door.

10966. Is Jane Railton the occupier of the house?—Yes; she appeared to be so. I did not go in; I was told she was.

10967. Did you inquire whether James Railton lodged there?—No.

10968. What should you say, from appearances, was the rent of that house?—I suppose about 25 *l.* was the full rent.

10969. Is there any other name as to whom you made search according to the address, but did not find they lived there?—Richard Gurney, of 13, King-street, St. James's; the house was shut up. I inquired of a person on the opposite side of the street, and they said they did not know such a name. It was an hotel the last time it was occupied; the Rutland Hotel: no such name as Gurney was known.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

10970. You are clerk to Messrs. Few & Company?—Yes.

10971. Not to Mr. Bircham?—No.

10972. You made some of these inquiries at the instance of Mr. Bircham?—He gave me my instructions; I received them from him to search out these cases.

10973. When was it you received it?—I received them from time to time.

10974. All those inquiries have been made by you at the instance of and by the direction of Mr. Bircham?—Yes.

10975. Does Mr. Bircham carry on business with Few & Company?—No; the only way he is connected with them is in the Southampton Railway.

10976. Are the Messrs. Few & Company solicitors to the Southampton Railway?—Yes; I believe they are.

10977. Were you in their service when the Southampton Railway Bill was obtained?—No, I was not.

10978. You have never had the curiosity to look over that deed?—No, I have not.

10979. How long ago was it you made those inquiries?—I may have been at it, off and on, now for the last month or five weeks.

10980. Do you yourself know of any arrangement, either in progress or contemplated, between the present company and the Southampton Railway Company?—No; I know nothing about the railroads.

10981. Your department has not led you at all into any knowledge of any circumstances connected with the Southampton Railway?—No; I have been called off from other business to attend to this.

10982. You know nothing at all about it with regard to the Southampton Railway Company, or this company?—No; I have only been in Messrs. Few's office for the last six months, to attend to the common law business.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Laxton,* called in; and Examined.

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

10983. Mr. *Hill.*] ARE you the engineer to the Southwark and Hammersmith Company?—Surveyor and engineer.

10984. Have you been so from the first?—Yes; in conjunction with Mr. Blunt.

Mr. *W Laxton.*

29 April 1837.

10985. Did you or Mr. Blunt become connected with the company first?—Both together.

10986. When was it that your connexion with it commenced?—Do you mean as to the first projection of the railway?

10987. Yes.—About October last year twelve months.

10988. Were you one of the original projectors of the railway?—I was.

10989. With whom did you project it?—With Mr. Blunt.

10990. Were you or Mr. Blunt the original projector of it?—I can hardly say. I suggested it to Mr. Blunt, in the way of conversation, that there was much wanted a railway to unite the whole of the metropolitan railways, and that they were so far distant from the city, that they ought to be brought immediately into the city, at the nearest points.

10991. That was the first idea of the railway, was it?—Yes.

10992. What was it called originally?—We originally intended to call it the Metropolitan Junction Railway.

10993. You and Mr. Blunt having originated this plan, what was the next step that you took?—I surveyed the whole of the district, to find out the best manner to accomplish the object.

10994. At your own expense?—Yes.

10995. Before any project for a company was formed?—Yes.

10996. Having made your surveys at your own expense, what was the next step?—After having well matured the plan, we consulted then how a company could be formed.

10997. When was this consultation as to the formation of a company?—You may call it one continued series of observations and conversations as to the formation of a company, from the month of October to the month of February or March.

10998. Of last year?—Yes.

10999. October 1835 to March 1836?—Yes.

11000. Was the project from October 1835 to March 1836 entirely confined to you and Mr. Blunt?—Yes.

11001. Whom did you admit in March 1836?—We consulted with Mr. Beetham, the solicitor.

11002. About forming a company?—Yes.

11003. Was he the first solicitor you applied to?—No.

11004. Who was the first?—Messrs. Winter, Williams & Faucett.

11005. You applied to them to become the solicitors?—Yes.

11006. Did they decline to become the solicitors?—They did not positively decline, but they were a long time before they would make up their minds to advertise it.

11007. Either by words or implication, did they at last decline it?—No; in consequence of their delay I said there was no time to lose, another party was attempting to steal our plans, and we must be prompt.

11008. You took it from them?—Yes.

11009. You and Mr. Blunt?—Yes.

11010. And put it into the hands of Mr. Beetham?—Yes.

11011. By your authority?—In conjunction with Mr. Blunt.

11012. Now we get you, and Mr. Blunt, and Mr. Beetham?—Yes.

11013. What steps did you, Mr. Blunt and Mr. Beetham take together?—I explained the project to Mr. Beetham; he thought it a very feasible project, and had no doubt it would be well supported in the market, and he immediately advertised it in the public papers.

11014. Had you had any acquaintance with Mr. Beetham previously?—I had known him some time before, but not personally; Mr. Blunt, I believe, had.

11015. You had not known him personally; in what way had you known him?—Only by name.

11016. As connected with what?—With no particular scheme; only as a solicitor.

11017. Did you know him in the year 1835?—No; I did not.

11018. Or know of him?—No; I did not.

11019. Now we find you, and Mr. Beetham and Mr. Blunt, we have got as far as the solicitor, the engineer, and the surveyor?—Yes.

11020. What department were you to have, surveyor or engineer?—It is a railway which you can scarcely tell whether it belongs to an engineer or a surveyor; in point of fact it requires some person to tell the distinction between them.

11021. I should

11021. I should like to know it?—So should I.

11022. You are not able to enlighten me upon the subject?—No; we are both in the dark.

11023. Did you consider your duties identical?—Yes; I was to take the whole of the surveying department.

11024. What does that imply, in your mind, distinct from the engineering department?—To survey the whole of the property, and absolutely to survey the land.

11025. And put a value on the property?—Yes.

11026. What was Mr. Blunt's department?—He was to make the drawings.

11027. Who was to plan out the railway?—Jointly.

11028. Were you to choose the line jointly?—Yes.

11029. Mr. Beetham was the solicitor, and he advertised; have you got the advertisement?—No, I have not; Mr. Beetham has.

[*A newspaper was produced.*]

11030. It was inserted in the "General Advertiser," the 9th March 1836?—It was about that time.

11031. "The City, Railway to unite the Birmingham, Great Western, Southampton, proposed Brighton, Dover, and the South Western Railway with the City of London and the River Thames, with a branch to Richmond, to be incorporated by Act of Parliament. Capital 1,000,000 *l.*, in shares of 50 *l.* each, deposit 2 *l.* per share. Directors: Hans Busk, esq.; Albert William Beetham, esq., F.R.S.; Richard Cooke, esq.; Henry Charles Dakeyne, esq.; James C. Disney, esq.; Thomas Smith Good, esq.; Robert Hay Graham, M.D.; Augustus William Hillary, esq.; the Hon. Warwick Lake; Admiral Maitland; Donald Maclean, esq., M.P.; Major M'Namara, M.P.; the Hon. Frederick William Mullins, M.P.; Captain Frederick Polhill, M.P.; Sir Wm. Rawlins; John Henry Walker, esq. Bankers, Messrs. Whitmore, Wells and Whitmore;" are those the present bankers?—Yes.

11032. "Engineers and surveyors: William Laxton, esq. and Charles John Blunt, esq.; Solicitor, Francis Beetham, esq.; Secretary, J. Binns, esq.; Office, No. 9, Mansion-house-street, opposite the Mansion-house.

"The projectors being convinced of the great inconvenience of the various termini of the metropolitan railways, and the necessity of centralizing the principal railways in one common terminus, which will be both convenient for the City and the river Thames, have been induced to submit to the public, after mature consideration and surveys made during a long period, the above most important railway.

"To show the inconvenience of the present termini of the above railways, it is only necesssary to refer to their situations, which are nearly three miles from the Bank, and four from the docks and port of London; the terminus of the Birmingham and Great Western Railway for goods is at Camden Town, on the banks of the Regent's Canal, and the only communication to the Thames is by that canal, through its tortuous windings and numerous locks; and, for passengers, at Somers Town. The terminus of the Southampton and the other proposed railways is at Nine Elms.

"The City Railway will not interfere with any public buildings, parks or pleasure grounds, and will pass through property of a very inferior description, which will be greatly improved by the railway; nor will it interfere with any property within the City boundaries.

"The route of the proposed line will commence at Southwark Bridge, and will proceed, bearing south-west, through Lambeth, within a short distance of all the bridges, touching Vauxhall Gardens, and passing close by Vauxhall Bridge to the Southampton terminus at Nine Elms, which is also intended to be the terminus of the proposed Brighton, Dover, and South Western Railways; it will then proceed to Battersea, crossing the Thames by a viaduct to Chelsea, and be continued, passing over and communicating with the Hammersmith and Uxbridge roads, to the junction of the Birmingham and Great Western Railways at Hardlesdon Green. The branch to Richmond will be a continuation from Battersea, and will pass through Wandsworth, Putney, and Mortlake.

"The transit the whole distance from the City to Hardlesdon Green or Richmond will be in twenty-five minutes; to Vauxhall in six minutes; to the Hammersmith Road or Putney in eighteen minutes.

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

29 April 1837.

"The proposed railway is intended to be carried on arches, the principal part of the line, which will be tastefully converted into shops, warehouses and dwelling-houses, and will form leading thoroughfares through the whole line, which will very greatly improve the streets branching from each side, particularly in Lambeth. The whole line is the most convenient for construction that can possibly be devised, considered with regard to expedition, durability and economy; to which may be added, the important feature that the whole of the line will be executed without any cuttings or tunnels.

"In a commercial point of view, the railway will be most important, as it will offer such facilities for the conveyance of goods to and from the Thames and the city, which no other railway or proposed railway offers; during the time goods are being conveyed to and from the Thames by the Regent's Canal, they may be conveyed from the wharf of the City Railway to Birmingham.

"By a reference to the map, it will be perceived that the railway will be particularly convenient for the following places: the City, Southwark, Westminster, Lambeth, Kennington, Vauxhall, Clapham, Battersea, Wandsworth, Putney, Wimbledon, Barnes, Mortlake, Richmond, Kew, Petersham, Ham, Kingston, Hampton, Teddington, Twickenham, Hounslow, Isleworth, Brentford, Ealing, Acton, Chiswick, Hammersmith, Kensington, Chelsea, Brompton, Fulham, &c.

"This railway will effect that which is so much desired by Parliament, viz., the concentrating into one common focus the railways which are now in active advancement, and thus superseding the necessity of numerous branches through the metropolis; and it will also effect the desired object of clearing the over crowded and leading thoroughfares of omnibuses, public conveyances, carts, waggons, &c.

"Application is about to be made in the present Parliament for a railway to connect the Birmingham and Great Western Railways with the Kensington canal. If that should be granted, arrangements will be effected for connecting the railway at that point, and stop at the Hammersmith-road.

"This railway will form the link to connect the chain of railways from the North to the South of England, and thus the transit from Manchester to Brighton or Southampton will be accomplished in about ten hours.

"The Richmond Branch.—It is intended to complete that portion of the line from the terminus of the Southampton Railway at Nine Elms, to Richmond, at as early a period as may be found practicable with a view to the working of that branch during the progress of the remainder of the works.

"The Directors reserve the power of not disposing of more than four-fifths of the number of shares for the present, and the remaining fifth will be preserved for landed proprietors connected with the line, if they should be required.

"No further call beyond the deposit will be required until an Act of Parliament be obtained to incorporate the company.

"Estimate of Income.

"The following calculations of passengers have been made from the official list at the Stamp Office, Somerset House, of the number of journies licensed to be made by each of the short stages which pass by or near to the proposed stations of the City Railway:

	£.	s.	d.
1,054,200 passengers per annum, between Battersea and Richmond, both inclusive, as now conveyed, calculating ten persons to each conveyance, at 1*s.* each passenger	52,560	–	–
715,400 - ditto - from Kennington, Vauxhall, &c. ditto, at 6*d.*	17,885	–	–
1,162,180 - ditto - from Hammersmith-road, calculating only six persons to each journey for every conveyance now travelling, at 9*d.*	51,082	9	–
312,800 - ditto - from Southampton and Brighton Railways, calculating only 8 persons ditto, at 6*d.*	7,820	–	–
475,320 - ditto - to and from the Birmingham and Great Western Railways, calculating only 6 persons ditto, at 1*s.* each	23,766	–	–
To a proportion of passengers travelling by steam-boats, pleasure-boats, &c.	2,000	–	–
Ditto, by their own or hired conveyances Ditto to Vauxhall Gardens during the season Ditto increase during the Epsom, Hampton-Court, Ascot, and other races, fêtes, &c.	7,500	–	–

To

To carriage of goods to and from all the short districts, also to the Southampton, Birmingham, Great Western, proposed Brighton and Dover Railways - - - - - - - - - - To wharfage and warehousing of goods, booking, &c. - - -	20,000	–	–
	£. 182,613	9	–
Deduct expenditure 30 per cent. - - - -	54,784	–	–
	£. 127,829	–	–
To rental of 1,800 arches, at 7 *l.* 10 *s.* each - -	13,500	–	–
Net income per annum - - - - - -	£. 141,329	9	–

which will allow a dividend of 14 per cent. on the the capital of one million.

" If the passengers increase in the same proportion as stated by Dr. Lardner,* the dividend will be nearer 30 per cent.

" It will be perceived by the above estimate, that the principal part of the income will be derivable from passengers now travelling by short stages, and which cannot be affected by any proposed line yet brought forward.

" Applications for shares to be made by letters, post paid, to the solicitor, Francis Beetham, esq., at his office, No. 8, Chatham-place, New Bridge-street; or to the secretary, at the offices of the company, opposite the Mansion-house."

11032*. This is March the 9th; was that about as early as it began to be advertised?—There was an advertisement in about two or three days before.

11033. In the beginning of March this prospectus appeared?—Yes, within a week.

11034. We have at present got only as far in your history as the accession of a very important officer, the solicitor.—Yes.

11035. But we were still at some distance from the body of the company; who was the next accession you got?—In point of directors?

11036. In point of time, who came next?—Mr. Binns had been acting in unison with us; from almost the commencement he was backwards and forwards at my house.

11037. Had any body else been acting in unison with you?—No.

11038. In the beginning of March there were you three officers, and Mr. Binns acting in unison with you?—Yes.

11039. What was the next step you took?—The formation of the Board of Directors, as appears by that advertisement.

11040. When was this board obtained?—I think in that week; it was in the commencement of March.

11041. It was in the first week of March you obtained it.—Yes.

11042. How was Mr. Hans Busk obtained?—Through Mr. Beetham.

11043. Mr. Albert William Beetham?—Through Mr. Beetham.

11044. Mr. Cooke?—Through Mr. Binns.

11045. Henry Charles Dakeyne?—Through Mr. Blunt.

11046. Who is Mr. Cooke?—A gentleman of fortune residing in Kentish Town.

11047. And Mr. Dakeyne?—A gentleman residing at Hamilton-place, Regent's Park.

11048. Can you give us the address in Kentish Town?—The secretary can give the addresses of the whole of them.

11049. James C. Disney, who obtained him?—Mr. Beetham.

11050. Thomas Smith Good, who obtained him?—I think he was introduced by Mr. Walker, subsequently; he was introduced first, and he introduced Mr. Good.

11051. Who introduced Mr. Walker?—Mr. Binns and myself together, I believe.

11052. You knew Mr. Walker?—Yes.

11053. What was Mr. Walker by profession?—A surgeon.

11054. Robert Hay Graham, a physician?—Yes; I introduced him.

11055. Augustus William Hillary?—I introduced him; he accepted it, but subsequently retired into the country.

11056. Are

* Dr. Lardner states that 'a probable estimate of the number of passengers to be expected on a projected line of railway, may be made by increasing the average number of passengers for the last three years by the common railroad in a twofold proportion.

'The average number of passengers daily between Liverpool and Manchester before the formation of the railway was 450, the present average is above 1300; the increase has been nearly the same at Kingstown to Dublin.'

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

29 April 1837.

11056. Are you able to say he accepted it?—Yes, by letter.

11057. Can you produce the letter?—I cannot immediately charge my memory that I have got the letter, but I can say positively it was by letter.

11058. Did you make the application to him?—Yes, by letter.

11059. What is Mr. Hillary?—A gentleman of fortune, who resided in Regent's Park, and now residing in Cumberland.

11060. The Honourable Mr. Lake?—Mr. Beetham introduced him.

11061. Is that a member of Lord Lake's family?—Now Lord Lake.

11062. Admiral Maitland, the Port Admiral at ——?—Mr. Beetham introduced him.

11063. Donald M'Lean, the member for Oxford?—That was entered by Mr. Blunt, but it appeared there was some mistake about him, and it was withdrawn.

11064. Who obtained Admiral Maitland?—Mr. Beetham.

11065. Who thought he had obtained Donald M'Lean?—Mr. Blunt; it was immediately withdrawn; the name is only in some of the first advertisements.

11066. How soon was it withdrawn?—In the first week, I think.

11067. This is the 9th of March?—I think it was withdrawn before any prospectuses were issued.

11068. Was it withdrawn by the 15th of March?—I think it was.

11069. You are sure it was withdrawn in March?—Yes, to the best of my recollection it was.

11070. How came Mr. Blunt to fall into that error, do you know?—No, I do not.

11071. Did Mr. Blunt report he had obtained Donald M'Lean?—Yes; he stated he would act as a director.

11072. Did you inquire for his authority for so stating?—No, I did not.

11073. You did not require the letter nor anything of the kind?—No.

11074. Major M'Namara, who obtained him?—Mr. Beetham.

11075. Where is his address?—

Mr. *Beetham.*] In Ireland; he is member for Clare.

11076. Mr. *Hill.*] The Honourable Frederick William Mullins?—Mr. Beetham.

11077. Captain Polhill?—Introduced by Mr. Dakeyne.

11078. Sir William Rawlins?—By Mr. Beetham.

11079. And Mr. Walker by yourself?—Yes.

11080. How many of those gentlemen have signed the deed?—I think Mr. Beetham could answer that better.

11081. Mr. Hillary, did he sign the deed?—No; he did not.

11082. Why did he not?—He was in the country; he found his occupations detained him in the country, and he declined acting.

11083. Did he ever hold any shares?—No.

11084. How soon did you leave his name out?—I should think in the month of May or June.

11085. He never acted at all?—No.

11086. Did he ever attend any meeting?—No.

11087. Did Mr. Warwick Lake ever attend any meeting?—No.

11088. He never acted?—No.

11089. Nor took any shares?—No, not that I am aware of.

11090. Admiral Maitland?—He attended the first meeting.

11091. Where was it held?—No. 9, Mansion-house-street.

11092. Were minutes taken?—Yes, they were.

11093. What was about the time?—The 17th of March.

11094. Who else were present at the time?—Albert William Beetham, esq.; Richard Cooke, esq.; Admiral Maitland; Henry Charles Dakeyne, esq.; John Henry Walker, esq.; Robert Hay Graham, M.D.; Frederick Polhill, esq., M.P.; John St. Leger, esq.

11095. Was he a director?—Yes, he is a director; but not in the first advertisement.

11096. Does he afterwards appear?—Yes, up to the present time. Hans Busk, esq.; Major M'Namara, M.P.

11097. Who obtained the name of Mr. St. Leger?—He was introduced by Captain Polhill, or Mr. Dakeyne.

11098. Did Mr. M'Lean ever attend any meeting?—No, he did not.

11099. And Major M'Namara, did he attend?—I have just read his name.

11100. Did he ever attend any other meeting?—I am not aware that he did.

11101. Did

11101. Did he attend more than one week?—I do not think he did—not many meetings.

11102. Is he still a director?—His name still appears.

11103. He has never acted?—I do not think he has signed the deed, I did not see it in the printed list; but I have not paid much attention to the deed, it not being in my department.

11104. And Mr. Mullins, did he sign the deed?—I do not think he has.

11105. Sir William Rawlins?—Yes, he has.

11106. For how many shares?—I think it is twenty shares.

11107. The names of all persons who have taken shares are upon that printed list?—Yes.

11108. The bankers, Messrs. Whitmore, Wells and Whitmore, were they elected the bankers?—I think they were named by Mr. Beetham.

11109. Are they still your bankers?—Yes.

11110. Where is the banking-house?—In Lombard-street.

11111. Are they your only bankers?—Messrs. Ransom & Co. also.

11112. Were they bankers created by the Board of Direction, or how was it?—I think they were named about the same time.

11113. Who took this office at No. 9, Mansion-house-street?—Myself and Mr. Binns.

11114. At what time?—In March.

11115. Before the Board was created?—Yes, before they had commenced sitting.

11116. You said, at your own expense you had made surveys?—Yes.

11117. You have made a survey of a railway to unite all these lines?—What do you mean by survey; do you mean taking the measurements throughout the district, or surveying the country to lay down a railway?

11118. I mean, first of all, fixing your line.—Yes, that we did.

11119. I mean, secondly, taking a survey as a surveyor, to ascertain the extent of the ground accurately, and the site of the ground accurately, you intended to occupy?—That was subsequently done.

11120. The accurate measurements were not made the 9th of March?—No.

11121. I also mean by survey, an estimate of the value of the property you were to take?—Merely an approximate estimate at that time.

11122. How did you form that?—Going over the extent of the ground, and taking a cursory view of the houses, and a comparison of the cost of other railways.

11123. How was the engineering department valued?—We made an estimate as to the construction, as to how many arches there would be, and so on.

11124. Who did, you or Mr. Blunt?—Yes.

11125. You say, at present you are the sole engineer?—The surveyor and engineer.

11126. You fill both capacities?—Yes; no other has been appointed.

11127. Have you ever constructed a railway?—No.

11128. How long have you been an engineer?—I have been a surveyor all my lifetime; I was born in my father's office, who was a surveyor, and, as I stated before, I wanted to find the difference between an engineer and surveyor.

11129. Have you ever made a canal?—I have not.

11130. Have you ever laid out any considerable line of road?—My practice has been principally confined to buildings, as a surveyor.

11131. Have you ever made a harbour?—No, I have not.

11132. Have you ever done anything which is commonly called a work of engineering?—I have not, as far as regards railways or harbours.

11133. Have you done anything of that kind?—No, I have not; that will shorten the questions.

11134. Was your father an engineer or surveyor?—A surveyor, in very extensive practice.

11135. He was also an auctioneer?—Yes.

11136. And you too?—Yes, formerly.

11137. Have you ever been employed under any engineer?—No.

11138. Have you studied in any office of an engineer?—No, I have made myself perfectly master of surveying, and there is very little difficulty in making yourself master of engineering, it is a very easy task.

11139. That is your opinion?—Yes.

Mr. W. Laxton.

29 April 1837.

11140. Do I understand you that engineering is an easy task?—Yes, it is, as to the construction of railways; it is mere moonshine as to the difficulties.

11141. This is the state of information which enabled you to estimate the capital would be 1,000,000 *l.*?—Yes, it was.

11142. *Chairman.*] The cost you mean?—Yes.

11143. Mr. *Hill.*] That the work could be done for 1,000,000 *l.*?—Yes.

11144. Have you got the documents upon which you came to that result?—Yes, I have.

11145. Have you any objection to produce them?—I will produce them on Monday.

11146. If it is unpleasant to you, I do not press it?—I have no objection to it: I think, when I come to consider it, it is rather confidential.

Mr. *Clarkson* suggested whether, in the event of this matter going on, as all these matters must be the subject of inquiry in another committee, it was expedient to go into such inquiry here.

The *Chairman* stated that an inquiry to ascertain the mode in which the estimates were made, or whether it was *bonâ fide*, was quite legitimate, as tending to elucidate the object the Committee had in view.

11147. Mr. *Hill.*] You said you were principally employed in buildings; have you been a builder?—No, I have not.

11148. What has been the nature of your employment?—Principally as a surveyor.

11149. What is called a building surveyor?—Yes.

11150. Measuring work done, and putting a price upon it?—Yes; and surveying generally, land as well.

11151. Did you ever erect a house yourself?—Yes.

11152. As a builder?—Yes, as a builder; not in the acceptation of the word builder, for other persons, but I have built houses.

11153. For yourself?—Yes.

11154. Your own property?—Yes.

11155. How long have you known Mr. Blunt?—I have known him since about July last twelve months; twelve months last July.

11156. In October you formed this very close connexion with him?—Yes.

11157. Did you take pains to inquire who and what he was?—I was informed he was an engineer, and that he was the publisher of a very excellent work called the "Civil Engineer," which is a work of considerable merit.

11158. Did you inquire as to his standing in society, and so on?—I did not.

11159. So as to be pretty certain of his respectability?—No; I did not.

11160. Do you know that Charles Blunt, the engineer, your coadjutor, had been bankrupt two years before?—Yes, I did.

11161. You knew that?—Yes, I did.

11162. Was there some dispute about some goods, that made you know it?—In what do you mean, dispute about goods; there was a general dispute as to his affairs generally between himself and his partner; they were the publishers of the work called the "Civil Engineer."

11163, I am speaking of two years ago; you only knew him in July of last year?—About a twelvemonth last July.

11164. You knew him in July 1835?—Yes; so I stated.

11165. Did you know about that time he was a bankrupt?—Yes, I did.

11166. Was he a bankrupt after you knew him, or before?—After I knew him.

11167. Do you know he is uncertificated?—Yes, I do.

11168. Are you quite sure it is only a twelvemonth last July, or two years last July?—No, I should say not; it was a short time before his bankruptcy that I was introduced to him, as an arbitrator to settle the differences between him and his partner; but they were so complicated, that bankruptcy was the result.

11169. Did you, as the founder of this undertaking, of uniting all the metropolitan railways, and all the proposed metropolitan railways, take as your coadjutor an uncertificated bankrupt?—He was a person that appeared to me possessed of a considerable deal of talent, that was the reason I first formed an acquaintance with him.

11170. It did not occur to you that the fact of his being an uncertificated bankrupt was an objection?—No; because I considered it was through difficulties he was not master of.

11171. When

11171. When you first knew Mr. Blunt, was not he a drawing clerk in Sir John Rennie's office?—No, he was not.

11172. Did you ever know him as a clerk in Sir John Rennie's office?—No, he was not; he was residing in Great Ormond-street, when I first knew him.

11173. The officers and the Board of Directors being appointed, and advertisements made, what was your next step?—To issue advertisements and prospectuses.

11174. I perceive, at bottom, "Applications for shares by letter, post paid, to Francis Beetham, esq., at his office, No. 8, Chatham-place, New Bridge-street; or to the secretary, at the offices of the company, opposite the Mansion-house." Did applications come in pretty freely?—They did, to a very large number.

11175. What was the date fixed for closing the applications for shares?—They were to be closed about the 30th of March.

11176. You say you know that the applications came in freely?—Yes.

11177. *Chairman.*] Was there any date fixed for issuing out letters of appropriation?—I think about 14 days or three weeks afterwards.

11178. That was the time for appropriation?—Yes.

11179. Mr. *Hill.*] How was that appropriation made, will you tell us?—Every letter was gone carefully into.

11180. Did you assist in it?—Yes, occasionally I did.

11181. *Chairman.*] Tell us who the parties were that took part in the business of appropriation?—The directors, themselves, and Mr. Beetham, the secretary, and Mr. Blunt was also there; and then there were parties employed to ascertain the respectability of the different applicants.

11182. Who were those parties?—I think eight or nine.

11183. Let me have the names? —

It was admitted that the number of shares to be issued was 20,000; that the number of shares applied for was 27,755, and the number of shares appropriated was 17,051.

Mr. *Beetham* produced the application and appropriation book for the City Railway Company; also a book containing the names of the parties who paid for shares, called the proprietors' book, which books it was agreed should be considered in evidence, and accessible to both parties.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that if those books were to be put in evidence, the person in whose custody they were should be called as a witness to produce them.

Mr. *Hill* stated, that notice had been given to produce the books; that the parties who had the custody of them would produce them or not; that if not produced, it would let the parties in to give secondary evidence of their contents.

The *Chairman* stated, it was not necessary to call the person in whose custody they were.

11184. Mr. *Hill.*] The applications were closed the 30th of March, and the appropriations made when?—I think the 20th of April, but Mr. Beetham can speak to that.

11185. How many shares were appropriated to you?—None at that time, but I made applications that some should be reserved for my friends.

11186. Did you make that application by letter?—No, I did not.

11187. But none were appropriated to you?—No.

11188. To whom did you make application?—To the directors.

11189. How was it done?—Personally.

11190. Did you attend at the Board meeting?—Yes; I said I should like to have some shares reserved for my friends.

11191. Were you attending the Board meeting at the time, and took a part in the management of the concern?—Yes, in the appropriation.

11192. But no shares were appropriated to you?—No; but there was a certain number that it was understood I might have.

11193. What was it?—150.

11194. *Chairman.*] Were the parties to whom the shares were, by the directors and yourself and Mr. Beetham, appropriated, the parties who were required to sign the parliamentary deed?—Yes; it was understood that they were to sign the deed.

11195. Supposing that those parties to whom the shares were appropriated in the first instance should transfer their shares to other parties, were those transferrees

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

29 April 1837.

allowed to sign the deed?—Whoever produced the bankers' receipt, it was considered that they had a claim to sign the deed; we could not refuse them.

11196. Whether they were the parties to whom the shares had been originally appropriated or not?—I believe they were; but I cannot speak as to the signature to the deeds, for I did not interfere in that department.

It was admitted by Mr. Beetham that the party who was permitted to sign the deed was not necessarily the party to whom the shares in the first instance had been appropriated; but that if he had parted with his interest to another person, that transferree, on producing the bankers' receipt, was allowed to sign the deed. The following documents produced by Mr. Beetham were delivered in:

"To the Directors of the City Railway Company.

"Gentlemen,

"I WISH to become a holder of ten shares in the above undertaking, if the list is not filled up, the deposit for which will be duly paid. I am, gentlemen, yours, &c. *W. Jennings.*

"8 March 1836. 9, Temple-lane, Temple."

[Endorsed] "To the Directors of the City Railway Company, 8, Chatham Place, Blackfriars Road."

"No. 411.

"Sir, "The City Railway, 9, Mansion-house-street, City, 13 April 1836.

"I AM desired by the Directors of the City Railway Company to acquaint you, in answer to your application for ten shares, that they have allotted you ten shares, upon which you are required to pay a deposit of 2 *l.* per share to the bankers, Messrs. Whitmore, Wells and Whitmore, Lombard-street, or Messrs. Ransom & Co., Pall Mall, on or before the 20th day of April instant; and if the same be not paid on or before that day, this allotment will be void.

"I am yours most respectfully,

"W. Jennings, Esq., 9, Inner Temple-lane." "*J. Binns,* Secretary."

"The City Railway.—Received on account of the Directors of 'The City Railway' the sum of twenty pounds, for Messrs. Ransom & Co.

"*£.* 20." "*Geo. Griffiths.*"

"The holder of this receipt, on exchanging it at the office of the Company, between the hours of 10 and 4 o'clock, and signing the Parliamentary engagements, will receive certificates for the number of shares to which he is entitled."

[Endorsed] "William Jennings, 9, Inner Temple-lane; 31, Mitre-street, Lambeth."

11197. When had you any shares appropriated to you?—About January last, when I took them.

11198. I want to know when you had any appropriated to you?—There were about four hundred shares set aside for the friends of the officers.

11199. At what time?—When we were appropriating the shares.

11200. In April last?—Yes, last year.

11201. Set aside?—Yes, for the friends of the officers.

11202. When did you avail yourself of that advantage?—It was for the benefit of the officers and their friends that this reservation was made.

11203. They were not bound to take them?—Yes; because they were set aside for us.

11204. Why were not they appropriated in the first instance?—It was understood we were to take them up when it was convenient to us.

11205. If it was not convenient to you, you were not bound to take them?—Yes, in honour I was.

11206. How many were you obliged to take in honour?—One hundred and fifty.

11207. Who were to take the others?—I cannot speak to the others; I can only speak to myself.

11208. Tell me any document by which you were bound to take 150?—There was no other document but honour.

11209. Did you apply to have 150 reserved for your honour?—Yes, I did.

11210. You took them in January, did you?—Yes.

11211. For whose benefit did you take them in January; you say they were reserved for the benefit of the friends of the officers: for whose benefit did you take them in January; who were to be benefited by them?—I paid the deposit, and requested my friends to take them in their name; being an officer of the company, I did not wish to make myself a partner by signing the deed.

11212. Was this in January?—Yes, in January last.

11213. There was an appropriation?—I paid the deposit on the 150 shares I had engaged to take.

11214. I want

11214. I want to know whether you had an appropriation at that time of shares; and if so, I want to see it?—There is no letter.

11215. You sent in no letter of application?—I did not.

11216. You have no letter of appropriation?—No.

11217. Now we come to the deposits; what did you pay deposits upon?—I paid 300*l.* deposits.

11218. You paid the sum of 300*l.*?—Yes.

11219. To whom?—To Mr. Gethen, the secretary, to pay it into the bankers'.

11220. At what time?—In January last.

11221. Did you inform Mr. Gethen what the project was, that you were to find parties to sign for these shares?—I stated that friends of mine would sign the deed; I am not quite sure whether I stated that or not. I requested him to pay the 300*l.* into the bankers' as deposits; I will not charge myself immediately with the precise terms.

11222. What form did you give Mr. Gethen the money in?—In bank-notes; three £100 notes.

11223. Bank of England notes?—Yes.

11224. Then you did not pay it to the bankers yourself, or get a receipt?—No, I did not.

11225. Did Mr. Gethen bring you the bankers' receipt?—He took the receipt; I do not think I ever had it in my custody; he kept the receipt.

11226. Do you recollect the date of it?—January 13th, I think it was.

11227. How many persons represent your shares upon this deed?—There are seven.

11228. Just give me the names?—Henry Laxton, 50; Mr. Northhouse, 50; Mr. Martin, 50; that made up the first 150 I agreed to take.

11229. You had then satisfied your honour?—Yes.

11230. How many more did you take?—126 more.

11231. How came you to take 126 more?—It was considered advisable that every exertion should be made by all parties to get rid of the remainder of the shares that were reserved for the landed proprietors.

11232. Is that the answer you intended to give?—Yes.

11233. What! had the landed proprietors declined the benefit of those shares?—There was not a call for them.

11234. Did any landed proprietors call for any?—I cannot answer that question.

11235. None to your knowledge?—Not to my knowledge.

11236. How many were reserved for landed proprietors?—I think three thousand, at that time.

11237. You mean in January last?—Yes; three thousand.

11238. Three thousand were reserved for landed proprietors?—Yes.

11239. Tell us all the reserves?—That was all they reserved.

11240. You have said there were some reserved for the officers?—I have stated that before.

11241. That is in addition to the 3,000?—Yes.

11242. How many for officers?—400.

11243. How many for the directors?—There was a reserve of 3,000; it was not expected that the whole would be taken up.

11244. When did you take the 126?—I took them also in January.

11245. At what time?—The latter part of January.

11246. I want you to come as near as you can; you seem to have a paper before you?—It is only the names of the parties; I have not got the dates; I should say it was in the last fortnight in January.

11247. Was not it within the last week?—I cannot speak positively to that.

11248. To the best of your belief, was not it in the last week?—No; in the last fortnight.

11249. 126 would require 252*l.*?—Yes.

11250. Did you pay that in?—I paid it subsequently.

11251. When was it paid?—April the 11th.

11252. Tell us how it was paid?—It was paid in the different parties' names; the name of Holland, for 30 shares; Blofield, 36 shares; Miller, 30 shares; and Arnold, 30 shares.

11253. How came you to change your plan; you had paid the first 300 *l.* in your own name?—Yes; it was in my own name.

11254. The 252 *l.* you paid in the names of other persons, what was the reason

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

29 April 1837.

of that change?—There was no particular reason; in fact, the first 150 shares ought to have been paid in three names.

11255. Do you know what was the price of shares in the market in January and December?—No, I do not.

11256. Were not they at a very great discount?—I believe they were.

11257. Have you any doubt of it?—I have no doubt of it.

11258. It would be a matter of daily inquiry with you, how the shares were going on?—Not latterly.

11259. Were they down so low?—Unfortunately all shares were.

11260. Of course yours were among the number?—Yes.

11261. When did they fall?—They began to fall generally, if I may so term it, at the panic, in about July; they all began to fall, and they have retrograded up to this time.

11262. Were yours ever at a premium?—I cannot answer that question.

11263. Did you ever hear of their being at a premium?—Yes.

11264. When?—At the commencement; but they were generally at par, and half-a-crown premium.

11265. They remained at par till July?—I would not say positively.

11266. About par?—Yes; about par.

11267. In July there was a tumble down?—Yes; generally with all railway shares.

11268. We are inquiring about these; were these among the number?—Yes.

11269. What did they fall down to in July?—That I cannot answer.

11270. Oh! yes, you can?—Oh no!

11271. You were bound in honour to take 150?

Mr. *Clarkson* inquired whether the state of the share-market had any bearing upon the question.

Mr. *Hill* stated he considered it a vital part of the inquiry.

11272. Mr. *Hill.*] How low did they come in July?—I cannot say.

11273. Were they at 1 *l.* in July?—I should say they were from 1 *l.* to 30 *s.* or a couple of pounds.

11274. If they were at 2 *l.*, they were at par?—Yes.

11275. You said there was a great fall?—They began to fall in July.

11276. What did they fall to in July?—I cannot tell you. I have answered the question before.

11277. We will go to August?—I cannot tell you; they have taken a range from 5 *s.* up to par.

11278. From par down to 5 *s.* you mean?—Yes.

11279. That makes a difference from par down to 5 *s.*?—Yes.

11280. When?—In January.

11281. They were down to 5 *s.* in January?—Yes.

11282. What are they now?—I do not know; I have made no inquiry.

11283. You left them at 5 *s.*?—Yes; but that I cannot speak to of my own knowledge; it is only hearsay.

11284. Considering you had discharged this debt of honour by taking 150 shares, how came you to take 126 shares at par, when the market price was 5 *s.*?—Because I had a greater stake in the prosperity of the concern than half-a-crown or 5 *s.* or a pound.

11285. What was the nature of the stake?—As an officer of the company.

11286. As a promoter of the company?—Yes.

11287. You were going to give me the names of the gentlemen who signed for the 126 shares?—I have given them to you.

11288. That was in addition to the other names?—Yes; the others were Henry Laxton, Northhouse, and Martin.

11289. Have you ever taken any more?—No.

11290. Having a great stake in the company, you wished the list to be well signed?—Yes.

11291. To get up above the half?—Yes.

11292. You knew Blofield, did you?—Yes, I did.

11293. Did you know that he had been insolvent?—Some years back.

11294. Did you know he had been through the Insolvent Court?—No, I did not.

11295. Will you just explain to me why as an officer of the company you could not have your name upon the deed?—I should have made myself a partner.

11296. But you had a great stake in it?—Of course; but I could not sue the directors, if they chose to turn me off.

11297. Who told you that your taking these shares and paying your deposits in the name of other persons to represent you upon the deed would prevent your being a partner?—Nobody told me; it was my own idea.

11298. That was your own notion of the law?—Yes.

11299. Is that the reason you have given to those persons?—Yes.

11300. And the only reason?—Yes.

11301. Have you told none of them the reason was, you could not give evidence before the Committee if your name was on the deed?—Yes; I think I might very likely say that as well.

11302. I wish you to be sure about it?—I think it very likely.

11303. I wish you to be sure?—I cannot be sure.

11304. You think you did?—Yes.

11305. That was one reason among others?—Yes.

11306. Who told you you could not be examined before the Committee if your name was on the deed; did anybody?—No; I will say no.

11307. How did you find it out?—From my general knowledge of business; I had had a great deal to do.

11308. With companies?—As an arbitrator.

11309. Not before Committees?—No; in my profession.

11310. How did your business, as an arbitrator, make you acquainted with the proceedings before Committees?—There are many things we get a knowledge of in our business, but we cannot tell how we get it.

11311. You know, then, the rule, that if a party has an interest he cannot be examined before Committees upon matters of opinion?—That was my opinion; I do not know whether it is the rule or not.

11312. Do you mean to say, when you came before the Committee you had no interest in this company?—No interest? Just put the question again.

11313. You say you were acquainted with the rule?—I do not know it is the positive rule.

11314. You say, that the reason that influenced you to ask persons to represent you upon this deed was, that you believed that parties who had an interest in the undertaking could not be examined before Committees upon matters of opinion?—It strikes me very forcibly I never did make use of that observation to any of the parties; you have put it into my mouth as if I did say so.

11315. Do not let anything come out of your mouth but the truth?—I hope not.

11316. Seeing the object, the question you had in view, what do you say, did you or did you not give that reason?—I do not think I did.

11317. Then you take upon yourself to say, that to no one of those persons who represent you upon that deed, you gave that reason?—I think I may safely say I did not.

11318. Perhaps you did not think of it?—As I stated before, I might have made the observation, but I do not think it is likely.

11319. Perhaps that was no reason operating upon your mind?—No, it was not; the principal reason, as I before stated, was, that I considered I should make myself a partner.

11320. Did all those persons sign willingly?—They did.

11321. Did you explain to them that they were going to make themselves responsible for a large sum of money?—I did not explain to them; they are all men of business, and I expected that they knew what they were going to sign; that they would not sign it unless they had a full knowledge of it.

11322. You did not explain it; if they had a full knowledge of it they had it not from you?—No, they had not.

11323. Is Mr. Martin one of the names you have given?—Yes.

11324. Were you present when Mr. Martin signed?—No.

11325. What did you ask Mr. Martin to sign?—I asked him to do me the favour to sign the deed of the City Railway, the deed for fifty shares; that I was an officer of the company, and could not take them myself without making myself a partner.

11326. Take care, (I do not say it invidiously,) I wish you to consider you have been mistaken twice; you told him you could not sign yourself without making yourself a partner?—Yes.

11327. That you clearly recollect?—Yes.

11328. And

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

29 April 1837.

11328. And you told him it was the deed of the City Railway Company?—Yes.

11329. Did you tell him it was the Parliamentary contract?—I am confident I did not; but I asked him to do me the favour to sign the subscription contract of the City Railway for me, for fifty shares; that I would pay the deposit and I would hold him harmless from any calls that might be made, and I gave him a letter to that effect.

11330. When was this; when did you ask Mr. Martin to sign?—In January.

11331. When did you give him the letter?—I will not be certain whether I gave it him at the time or subsequently, but it was understood.

11332. The time is very material?—I did not give it him at the time.

11333. When did you give it him?—I should say within a month afterwards; I should say within a fortnight or a month afterwards.

11334. *Chairman.*] When was it?—The latter end of February or the beginning of March.

11335. Mr. *Hill.*] You gave him that letter?—Yes, it was always understood I was to give him a letter.

11336. Without minding what was understood, I wish to know the time you gave it him?—I will not be positive to the time it was, I will not charge my memory, but it was in the month of February or March.

11337. Might it not be in April?—I think not.

11338. Can you be quite sure it was not in April?—No, I cannot; to the best of my knowledge it was not, but I cannot be sure of it.

11339. Mr. Blofield you knew had been insolvent?—He had been a bankrupt about five years ago, but he is in very good circumstances now.

11340. He is?—Yes.

11341. What is he now?—A builder.

11342. Millar, what is he?—He frequently assists me as a draftsman and as a surveyor.

11343. Do you think him equal to 30 shares?—He would look to my responsibility.

11344. Arnold the grocer, do you know him?—I do.

11345. He was looking for employment in your office?—No, he was not.

11346. Not in the Railway office?—No, he had been engaged with some of the parties who assisted me, but not me personally.

11347. Are what you have told us the only dealings you have had in shares belonging to this company?—Do you mean in this company.

11348. I mean in this company, taking it in all its forms and shapes?—I purchased a hundred shares in the market.

11349. When was that?—About August last.

11350. I am very curious to know the price?—I gave from 30 *s.* to 32 *s.* 6 *d.*

11351. Each?—Yes.

11352. None less than 30 *s.*?—Yes.

11353. None more than 32 *s.* 6 *d.*?—Yes.

11354. Have you signed for them?—I have not.

11355. Does anybody represent you?—No; I bought them in the public market.

11356. Other persons have signed for them?—Yes.

11357. Do you hold them now?—I do not, they have been deposited with a friend, and have never been sold by me.

11358. They are deposited with a friend?—Yes.

11359. As a security?—No, with a friend for him to take care of.

11360. Have you any objection to tell the name of your friend?—I have.

11361. I am afraid I must press you; he has possession of them?—I have no objection to state it to you privately; I should not wish to mention it publicly.

11362. Just tell me the time it was?—It was about August last.

11363. When did you lodge them with a friend?—About the same time.

11364. Was it on your own account you bought them?—Yes.

11365. Have you any objection to say who you bought them from?—It was on the public market, from a broker.

11366. Who was the broker?—Mr. Young was one broker, and Mr. Sutton was the other.

11367. They were the brokers that purchased them?—Yes.

11368. You

11368. You bought them through them?—Yes.

11369. Why did you buy those shares, considering you had 150, to which you were bound in honour?—I considered that they were down as low as they would go, and that it would be a good speculation on my own private account.

11370. Have you ever dealt in them for less?—No, never.

11371. Did I understand you right, you had had no dealing for shares, except those you bought in August and the 150 and 126?—That is all.

11372. Making 376?—276, that I subscribed for.

11373. You have told me you made certain surveys, from which you found the cost of this line of railway would be a million.—Yes.

11374. What was the length of the line?—It was six miles and three quarters from the Hammersmith-road.

11375. Where did you start from at your first terminus?—Southwark-bridge was the starting point.

11376. The iron bridge?—Yes.

11377. Where did you go next?—The terminus for the city was at the Southwark-bridge; it then proceeded south-west through Saint Saviour's, Christchurch, and Lambeth within a short distance of the bridges.

11378. And the river?—Yes; on to Nine Elms, where it was proposed to unite with the Southampton Railway; then proceed through the parish of Battersea, crossing the river Thames, and then through the parish of Fulham by the side of the Kensington canal to the Hammersmith-road, and there it was to stop, provided the Birmingham, Bristol, and Thames Junction Railway obtained an Act of Parliament; but provided they did not, it was then intended to be continued to Harlesden-green, and unite with the Birmingham and Great Western railways.

11379. Where would it unite with the Birmingham?—At Harlesden-green; it was intended that the Great Western and Birmingham should unite there, but that is abandoned.

11380. Was all that to be done for a million?—Yes, it was.

11381. Even if this Thames Junction was not made?—Yes; there would have been a considerable saving in carrying that part in assisting the remainder.

11382. Is the whole distance you have given to be done for a million?—For less than a million, it would.

11383. That is the whole?—No, the branch to Richmond.

11384. All that you have now told us, and the branch to Richmond, was to be done for a million?—Yes.

11385. It was called the City Railway?—Yes.

11386. What was the next form the project took?—In what stage?

11387. Go through the stages you have given me of the General Railway.—You did not go systematically to work; you first examined me upon the survey, then the shares, and now you revert to the survey again.

11388. Perhaps as you understand engineering without learning it, you understand my trade without learning it; but we will go on in the old-fashioned clumsy way, and I must beg you to answer my questions. What was the next shape your project took, when you changed it into something else?—I am not aware of it.

11389. You did not come to Parliament for that?—Except the branch to Richmond.

11390. When did you cut off that branch?—You had better refer to the public advertisements; it was in the last autumn; I believe it was in November or December.

11391. You have lopped off this branch to Richmond?—Yes.

11392. What was the estimate of that truncated railway to Richmond?—150,000*l.*

11393. That lopped off 150,000*l.*?—Yes.

11394. You could do the remainder for 850,000*l.*?—Yes.

11395. Was it slipped a little shorter after that?—Yes.

11396. What did you lose the next operation?—It was intended to abandon that portion from the Waterloo-bridge-road to the Southwark-bridge.

11397. To commence at Waterloo-bridge instead of the Southwark?—The Waterloo-bridge-road for this session.

11398. What was it called then?—It was called the City Railway.

11399. *Chairman.*] What did that lop off in the cost?—About 270,000*l.*

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

29 April 1837.

11400. In addition to the 150,000 *l.* that the abandonment of the Richmond line lopped off, there was a further sum of 270,000 *l.* lopped off?—Yes.

11401. Mr. *Hill.*] That would leave about 580,000 *l.* ?—Yes.

11402. When was the last lopping off made; before you went to Parliament, or since?—Since.

11403. What remained after those prunings?—From Waterloo-bridge-road to Hammersmith-bridge-road.

11404. Was the last alteration made in the Committee on the Bill?—Yes.

11405. That is so?—Yes.

11406. What is the present state of it?—It is proposed to start from Waterloo-bridge-road this sessions, and proceed to the Hammersmith-road; they are to unite with the Birmingham, Bristol and Thames Junction Railway.

11407. You said it was not quite certain whether you should make one portion, namely, that called the Thames Junction portion; what did you allow for that?—That requires some explanation; that portion from the Hammersmith-road to Harlesden-green would be in an excavation, and that excavation would have formed the embankment between the Thames and the Hammersmith-road, and, therefore, a saving of the very great expense of a viaduct.

11408. Having taken this matter into consideration; what did you allow for that portion?—I consider that that portion would be about the expense of forming the other part, about 60,000*l.*

11409. You get that portion for nothing?—Yes; on that account it would save us forming a viaduct; where we should have had an embankment, there was some excellent brick earth, which would have made the whole of the bricks for the rest of the work, which would be a great advantage.

11410. To make that portion would not have at all increased your estimate?—It would not.

11411. And to leave out that portion did not diminish your estimate?—No, it did not.

11412. Do you remember what the Parliamentary estimate of the Thames Junction for making that portion of it is?—I do not know their estimate; their capital is 170,000*l.*, which is very considerably more than they require; they are proposing to extend it up to Knightsbridge-road with the same capital.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

11413. You have told my learned friend, that in the course of the line you have proposed to take, when you started from the Southwark-bridge-road, it was proposed to unite with the Southampton Railway Company?—Yes.

11414. Had you, at any time, any meeting with the authorities of the Southampton Railway Company for that purpose?—I had.

11415. When was it?—It was, I should say, about November last.

11416. How long were you in treaty with them upon the subject?—I suppose we were in treaty, off and on, for two or three months.

11417. Were they to receive any bonus from you for permission to join?—They proposed to us to abandon that part of the railway from Nine Elms to where the branch commences leading over the Thames, and to make use of their railway. We stated that we should have no objection to adopting that plan, provided they would make a viaduct suitable for the purposes of our railway; and then a negotiation took place as to the tolls that should be paid by each company; the Southampton Railway Company wanted a toll, and also a portion of the capital for forming the railway from Nine Elms to where the branch was proposed to commence. I proposed to them a toll on behalf of the City Railway, that they should pay us sixpence for every passenger who came upon the railway between Nine Elms and Southwark bridge.

11418. What was the result of the arrangement?—I considered at first we had pretty well concluded an amicable arrangement; but, to my very great surprise, some time afterwards we understood that no arrangement would be entered into, and all the previous negotiations were put an end to, although there was a clause drawn up by Messrs. Few, Hamilton & Few, which we considered an amicable clause between the two companies, and was submitted to Mr. Beetham for his approval, and intended to be introduced into our Bill, and also into the Bill of the Southampton Railway Company, brought in this session, which has passed the Commons and is now in the Lords, and there it remains.

11419. And

11419. And the arrangement ultimately went off very much to your surprise?—Yes, it did.

11420. Can you tell us why it went off?—They made what I considered such an unreasonable demand, that they were to come upon our railway upon the same terms that we were to go upon theirs; their railway cost them about 15,000*l.* a mile, and ours about 200,000*l.* I said it was perfectly ridiculous to make such a demand.

11421. The land you went through was so much more expensive?—Yes; we had the whole of the London part to go through, and they had no houses to go through.

11422. Was it on account of the exorbitant terms they proposed to you that the arrangement went off?—Yes, it was.

11423. Did the railway originally contemplated pass through any land, described as that of a petitioner of the name of Lill before the Committee?—His house is in the schedule.

11424. Do you know of any remonstrance made by him before the Committee of the House of Commons before whom the Bill was, upon the subject of the railway passing through his lands?—Not personally, I do not.

11425. Did you hear of any complaint being made by him till one was made as it appears through the agency of Mr. Bircham?—No.

11426. Has Mr. Lill anything to do with the Southampton Railway Company —Not that I know of.

11427. You have been asked upon the subject-matter of the direction of this company, and the different names of the directors, and you have given them to us; are they the same directors now that were originally contemplated, or are some altered; is there any change except in the instance of Mr. M'Lean of Oxford?—Yes, and Lord Lake, and Mr. Hillary's name no longer appears.

11428. Does Admiral Maitland's appear?—That has been taken out lately, on account of his death.

11429. I believe you have been asked what was the reason that Mr. M'Lean's name has been removed; was any statement made by Mr. M'Lean as to his constituents at Oxford connected with the canal?—Not to me; that was stated to Mr. Blunt.

11430. What was his explanation of the removal?—He stated that his objection was the connexion of his family with various canals.

11431. Do you yourself know whether the gentlemen whose names now appear as the directors of this company are persons of station in society and of considerable means?—I believe, to the best of my knowledge, they are all men of considerable property.

11432. Do you know or believe that, in any instance, there has ever been a single farthing paid to anybody for the purpose of subscribing their names as shareholders?—I can say decidedly not.

11433. Do you know or believe of any small commission, in the language of Mr. Lill, through the agency of Mr. Bircham, however small, having been given, in any shape or money's worth, to procure signatures?—I am quite satisfied there has not been a farthing paid.

11434. Are you able to tell the Committee whether it has been the custom, in former railways, for persons if they like to exchange their scrip when they get it, or their memorandum for shares, between the time of their signatures and after they have paid the deposit?—I have generally understood, whoever produced the bankers' receipt, the company was bound to give them the scrip in exchange, upon signing the deed.

11435. You have heard that this has been the ordinary custom of railroads, before this speculation was entered into?—Yes; I have understood it was so; I cannot speak of my positive knowledge.

11436. Would it be within the power of any body of directors to ascertain the property, or the nature of the property, of the different persons entitled to pay their deposits into the bankers', and demand scrip?—There would be a very great difficulty to do so; we find that men who hold up their heads the highest are the poorest sometimes.

11437. As far as those inquiries could be made, do you know that such inquiries have been suggested by the directors of the company?—I know that the directors took every pains they possibly could to allot the shares to respectable parties; there were seven or eight parties out for two or three weeks making inquiries, and there

Mr. W. Laxton.

29 April 1837.

are many letters which might be shown confidentially, and it will be seen written on the back "bad," and no shares were allotted.

11438. And where the shares were allotted, it was generally the result of applications of persons for them?—Yes; and principally by letter.

11439. And these letters are among the records of the company, in case the Committee choose to call for them?—They are.

11440. You have been speaking upon the subject of the amount of capital; what was the amount of the moiety of the sum for which the company went before the Committee on the Standing Orders, to satisfy that Committee that they had fulfilled the Standing Orders of the House?—£. 425,245.

11441. Now, I understood you to state that the result of the alterations that have been made since the Bill has been in progress, and the last of which was made in Committee, the whole estimated cost to the company will be 580,000 *l.*?—Yes.

11442. So that, within 100,000 *l.*, the whole sum of the present speculation has been actually subscribed?—Yes.

11443. Have you heard the names of the persons that have been mentioned by the different witnesses examined; I do not know whether you have been in the room any time?—Yes, by permission of Mr. Bircham, I have been in the room sometimes.

11444. Have you been furnished with the names of the persons with respect to whom suggestions had been made of their incapacity?—Some of the names I have heard of being impugned, such as Mr. Gurney, whom I have always understood was the brother of Mr. Gurney the banker.

11445. Have you taken pains to ascertain what is the whole amount of the shares of the several persons, whose capacity to pay has been impugned by the witnesses in the course of this inquiry?—No, I have not.

11446. There will be no difficulty in doing it?—No, none I believe whatever.

11447. You have spoken of 150 shares, and 126 shares, as having been reserved for the friends of the officers?—150.

11448. Not taken by them in their own names, for the reasons you have assigned?—Yes.

11449. Is it your intention, and has it ever been your intention, to perform all the liabilities and responsibilities which the taking those shares in the names of the persons you have given imposed upon you?—Yes.

11450. Have you paid the deposit upon all those shares?—Yes, I have.

11451. Do you know whether the company have entered into any engagement or arrangement with the Thames Junction Railway to join them?—Yes.

11452. Have they effectuated their arrangements?—Yes, they have.

11453. Have the Thames Junction Company succeeded in obtaining their Act of Parliament?—Yes, and it is in active progress.

11454. Perhaps you can tell me whether they have had the good luck to be before this honourable Committee?—They have not.

11455. Mr. *Hill.*] Have they got through?—Yes, last year, fortunately.

11456. Mr. *Clarkson.*] And the Southampton Railway Company too?—Yes.

11457. Do you know of any company projected called the South London Union Railway?—Yes.

11458. Was it projected at the same time that this company was?—The advertisement came out the day afterwards.

11459. Can you tell the Committee whether the South London Union Railway contemplated the same benefits to the public, by means of the connexion of their plan with the Southampton Railway and the other metropolitan railways, to bring them into the heart of the City?—They only propose to extend the Southampton Railway.

11460. That company did not contemplate to do more than to connect that Railway.

Mr. *Hill* stated that the advertisement was the best evidence, and ought to be produced.

Mr. *Clarkson* was heard in answer to the objection.

Mr. *Clarkson* was directed to proceed with the examination.

11461. Mr. *Hill.*] You were not a member of the South Union Company?—No; I am speaking from the advertisement and prospectus.

11462. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You say that the object of that company was to connect the Southampton Railway Company with the heart of London?—Yes.

11463. Were

11463. Were the directors of that company the same as the directors of the Southampton company?—They were, principally; there are some other directors, not belonging to it.

11464. Were the solicitors the same?—Yes, and the engineers the same.

11465. Were the bankers the same?—Messrs. Wright were the bankers, and I believe they are the bankers of the Southampton Railway Company.

11466. Has it been given up?—I believe it has; but I am not positive whether they still have a hankering after it, or whether they do not wish to carry it on still.

11467. If your Bill does not succeed, the field will be open to them again?—No doubt they will have a try for it.

11468. Do you happen to know, or have you heard, whether the London South Union Company paid back their deposits after they abandoned their scheme?—I never heard that they had.

11469. Was it a part of the proposition made to you by the Southampton Rail way Company, that you should pay the expense of the South London Union?—There was a proposition of that kind.

11470. Who was it made by?—It was made to Mr. Beetham.

11471. You have stated in the account you have given of the concoction of this railway, that you originally consulted Messrs. Winter & Williams, and that they hesitated; and you being desirous of going on at once, and finding that some other party had attempted to steal your plans?—Yes.

11472. You went to Mr. Beetham?—I did.

11473. Have you any objection to tell us who the parties were that wanted to get your plans?—The Southampton Company; Mr. Giles was the engineer, and Few, Hamilton & Co. the solicitors, and Mr. Wright the banker.

11474. Mr. *Hill.*] Those gentlemen wanted to steal your plans?—Yes, they did.

11475. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You do not mean that they wanted to steal them, but wanted to get the benefit of them?—Yes.

11476. The engineers of the South London Union Company wanted to avail themselves of what had been the result of the surveyors of the Hammersmith Bridge Railway Company?—Yes.

11477. You have spoken about Mr. Blunt, and you say you knew he had been a bankrupt some two years before that time?—Yes.

11478. And that Mr. Stephenson, whose name has been mentioned, was in partnership with him?—Yes.

11479. Is that the gentleman I may now call the great Mr. Stephenson?—No; another gentleman.

11480. It is not the same gentleman?—No, decidedly not; and no relation to him.

11481. You have been asked upon the nature of this scheme; and when the ground was traversed, in your judgment as a surveyor, with the experience you have had, do you believe that this may be brought to maturity with advantage to the shareholders?—Most decidedly.

11482. Do you happen to know whether Mr. Stephenson, the gentleman to whose eminence I have referred, has had an opportunity of seeing the plans of this company?—He has.

11483. Will you tell the Committee whether you know what his opinion is upon the subject?—Mr. Stephenson has approved of the project, and said it was a much better project than the one he contemplated, of extending the Southampton Railway terminus to the Waterloo-bridge-road: there was an intention of extending the Birmingham Railway up to the other side of Waterloo Bridge, and he said, we had taken most decidedly the best line in relation to the levels and the property through which it passed.

11484. Do you happen to know whether there have been more shares subscribed for since the Committee on the Standing Orders came to a resolution that the Standing Orders had been complied with?—Yes, there had.

11485. Can you tell us the extent?—No, I cannot.

11486. Can you tell me from your experience, and you have spoken of some shares being reserved for the officers of the company, has that been the common practice in railway companies?—I believe in all companies.

11487. You stated just now, that at a particular period in April last, it was considered advisable that every exertion should be made to get rid of the remainder of the shares; what do you mean by getting rid of them?—For the parties themselves;

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

29 April 1837.

selves; for instance, I was to make all exertions I could amongst my friends to get rid of a few more shares.

11488. To dispose of them to any person you could procure to take them?—Yes.

11489. How long have the shares of this company been in the market?—I cannot answer that question.

11490. A person of the name of Stokes has been mentioned; do you know him?—I know him as a broker on the Exchange.

11491. Was he ever a sharebroker to this company?—Not that I am aware of.

11492. Are you aware there ever was such an officer as a sharebroker to the company?—I never heard that there was.

11493. You have stated to my learned friend you bought a hundred shares more in the market because you thought it would be a good speculation?—Yes.

11494. Do you still continue to think so, provided this Committee do not determine hostilely to the undertaking?—Yes; most decidedly.

11495. Are you aware of any other opposition to the success of this company, excepting that of the Southampton Railway?—Most decidedly they are the principal opponents; I believe all other parties are parties who are entirely opposing for compensation.

11496. Do you know whether Mr. Bircham, who is a petitioner, has any other interest except what he acquires as solicitor to the Southampton Company?—I never heard that he was connected with any landed proprietors except those on the Southampton Company.

11497. Except Mr. Lill?—I do not think he has any connexion with him. Mr. Lill has disowned him; he has stated he did not employ him.

11498. Does the proposed plan pass through any part of the property of Sir John Lillie?—It does.

11499. Where about?—Upon the road from Earls Court to North End.

11500. Did Sir John Lillie attend as an opponent of the company in the Committee before whom the Bill is that is now in progress?—He did.

11501. Do you happen to know whether Sir John Lillie has attended any public meeting of the company, or any person connected with him?—He has attended a meeting of the opponents at the King's Arms, Palace-yard.

11502. Were you there?—No, I was not.

11503. Do you happen to know, I believe the fact is so, that Sir John Lillie has presented a petition to this Committee against this list?—Yes, he has.

11504. Do you know whether he has withdrawn it?—He has not petitioned the House to withdraw it; but he has by letter to the company, stating he has no intention to prosecute the petition; that he has been deceived.

Mr. *Hill* suggested that the letter had better be produced.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that he was only following the course that had been pursued throughout the inquiry.

The *Chairman* stated that the letter had better be produced.

11505. Have you had any conversation with any agent of Sir John Lillie upon the subject?—Yes.

11506. When was it?—In the last month.

11507. Be so good as to state what the conversation was.

Mr. *Hill* stated that the agent had better be produced.

11508. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you ever had any conversation with Sir John Lillie himself?—Yes.

The *Chairman* stated, that the conversation with the agent of Sir John Lillie might be given in evidence.

11509. State the conversation you had with his agent?—Sir John called upon me, and showed me a letter he had received either from Mr. Few or Mr. Hamilton, to attend a public meeting in Palace-yard, stating, "I know you detest all humbug companies; may I beg of you to attend this meeting." He accordingly did attend, and he was requested to take the chair.

11510. *Chairman.*] This is what he told you?—Yes; he took the chair at the public meeting, and he asked Mr. Hamilton or Mr. Few, whoever it was, what proof he had that this was a humbug company; he could not give him any proof. He said, you have called upon us to oppose this company without showing us any grounds to justify you in calling the company by that name, and consequently he declined pursuing or joining the opposition to it. He subsequently stated to me, he had been very much deceived by the different parties who had attended that meeting,

Mr *W. Laxton.*

29 April 1837.

meeting, which was the reason he presented that petition against the company to the House of Commons a short time since.

11511. Does that refer to the petition now before this Committee?—I do not think it has been referred to the Committee; it was referred to the Committee on the Bill. I think he subsequently stated he wished to withdraw his charges against the company.

11512. I have found the letter, and therefore produce it?—This was addressed to the directors.

[*The following Letter, addressed to the Directors, was put in and read:*]

Gentlemen, St. John's, Fulham, April 19, 1837.

Having been informed by your engineer that you do not intend to persevere in your intention to intersect my lands by an elevated viaduct, I have to inform you that it is not my intention to offer any further opposition to your Bill, and I think it but justice to add, that since my petition was presented to the House of Commons, I have ascertained that the representations previously made to me at a meeting at which I was invited to attend in opposition to your Bill (at the King's Arms Tavern, Westminster-bridge,) were unfounded, and that the parties who called that meeting were actuated more by interested motives, in connexion with another company, than by any valid grounds of objection to yours. Being a director of the Birmingham, Bristol and Thames Junction Railway Company, of which yours is an extension, I always looked upon the project, of its being the connecting line between the railways north of the Thames and those south of that river, as one of the most important propositions now before Parliament; but I could not understand how that could be accomplished by your crossing the Great Western road at the point of junction, with an elevation, as I was informed, of seventeen feet above the surface, while by our Act we are compelled to pass under that road. Those objections being now removed, I have only to observe, that you may make any use you think proper of this letter, in order to remove any unfavourable impressions that may have been occasioned by my petition against your Bill.

I have the honour to be, gentlemen, your very obedient servant,

John Scott Lillie.

To the Directors of the Hammersmith
and Southwark Railway Company.

11513. Mr. *Lushington.*] Is there any rule of the company prohibiting its officers taking shares?—There is not.

[The Witness withdrew.

Henry Daniel Martin called in; and Examined.

Mr. *H. D. Martin.*

11514. Mr. *Clarkson.*] HAVE you been in the room all day?—I have been in the room part of the time; but when I heard any part of the examination connected with myself, I immediately went away.

11515. Mr. *Hill.*] What are you?—An engineer and surveyor.

11516. Are you employed by any person?—I hold a situation to the East India Dock Company as their engineer.

11517. Principal engineer to the East India Dock Company?—Yes.

11518. Were you asked by Mr. Laxton to sign this deed?—Yes.

11519. Tell us what he said to you?—I was leaving his house one night, and he asked me to call upon Mr. Beetham.

11520. Had he previously spoken to you about it?—No, he had not, to sign my name; I did not ask him what for; he said, he wished me to go next morning; I said, what for; he said, Mr. Beetham knows it.

11521. Was that all that occurred about it?—Yes; I think that was all. Nothing more at that time; there was something subsequent.

11522. Go on?—I went to Mr. Beetham next morning, and put down my name. I told him I had called from Mr. Laxton; he said, "50—(2,500*l.* I think it was)—I deliver this as my act and deed."

11523. Was that before you signed, or afterwards?—Afterwards. I said, I suppose you are aware I come from Mr. Laxton. He said, "I know nothing about that;" and I think that was the whole of the conversation.

[*The signature of the Witness on the deed was shown to him.*]

Witness.] That is my signature.

11524. And the whole line is in your handwriting?—Yes.

11525. Witnessed by Francis Beetham?—Yes.

11526. Is that all that occurred at the Railway Office?—At Chatham-place; yes, that was all; I am nearly convinced that was all; I do not think there was another syllable uttered.

11527. Was the deed read over to you?—No.

Mr. *H. D. Martin.*

29 April 1837.

11528. Or explained to you?—No.

11529. Did you know what it was?—No; my own impression was, that it was a petition, a subscription. I did not know it was a deed; I did not know what it was; that was the fact.

11530. What did you believe you had done?—I did not think I had done anything of any importance. Subsequently I had heard I had signed the deed. I then wrote to Mr. Laxton about it. I was rather indignant at the circumstance, and wrote to Mr. Laxton rather harshly.

11531. How long was this after you had signed?—I think it was about two days. Mr. Laxton wrote back word, saying—

11532. Have you got that letter?—No; I brought it with me, but I have lost it out of my pocket since I have been here in the passages.

11533. *Chairman.*] Can you state the purport of it?—Yes, I can; I have no doubt I dropped it in the corridor. He said he would hold me irresponsible from any future liability.

11534. What then?—I told him that was not sufficient; that I wanted a guarantee from the directors, that they would hold me irresponsible, which he could not procure.

11535. Did you write to him for it?—No; I asked him for it personally.

11536. What did he say?—That he could not get it.

11537. When was this?—Within the same week.

11538. Have you given us the date of the signature at the time you signed the deed?—No.

11539. When was that?—I think it was about three months ago.

11540. Was it before Christmas or since?—Since Christmas.

11541. In January?—I think it was in January.

11542. Was it towards the latter end of January?—I should think it might be.

11543. He could not get you the guarantee of the directors, what then?—Then I was satisfied with this note which he gave me; I was compelled to be, in fact.

11544. It was a sort of compulsory satisfaction?—I suppose so.

11545. Did Mr. Laxton, when he asked you to sign your name, tell you the reason why he could not sign himself, or say anything about it?—No; he did afterwards; he did not at that time.

11546. Did he before you had signed?—I think not.

11547. Be sure about it?—I am sure of it.

11548. Did you see him again, except at this short interview you have spoken of, before you signed your name?—No; I did not.

11549. Had you any conversation with him about what you were to sign, for what sum you were to sign, or what was the reason he could not sign himself?—To the best of my belief, I had not.

11550. Do I understand you to say, that the conversation which you had just at parting with him at night was the only conversation you had on the subject previous to your signing?—To the best of my belief, that was all.

11551. Had you any other conversation at any other time?—Not at any previous date.

11552. Is it true that Mr. Laxton said to you, in the conversation to which you have spoken, or at any time before you signed the deed, that he asked you to do him the favour to sign the deed for the City Railway for 50 shares, is that true?—I really cannot recollect, I do not recollect anything of the sort, certainly.

11553. Should you not recollect it if it was so?—No, I should not, one way or the other; I should say it was not so, to the best of my belief.

11554. Did he say that his reason was, why he could not sign himself, that he was an officer of the company, and that he could not sign himself without becoming a partner, before you signed?—No, not before I signed; I think not; nay, I am almost sure.

11555. Are you not quite sure?—No, I am not; to the best of my belief, certainly not; such a conversation could not take place, because we were not conversing more than half a minute, and it was just as I was leaving his house.

11556. Did he tell you at that time, or at any time before you pressed him by letter, that he would hold you harmless against any demand that might be made?—No, he did not.

11557. When did he give you this letter you have lost out of your pocket?—I should think three or four days after I had signed the deed.

11558. I mean

Mr. *H. D. Martin.*

29 April 1837

11558. I mean the last letter?—I think three or four days after.

11559. Have you the shares?—I have.

11560. Have you got them here?—I have not.

11561. Why did you not bring them?—I did not know that they would be wanted; I have them at home.

11562. What is the date of them?—I cannot tell; I have not read them over. I put them in the bookcase without looking at them.

11563. When did you receive them?—I cannot tell the date; I should say about two months ago.

11564. How long was it after you signed the deed?—I should think after an interval of four weeks.

11565. Did you apply for them?—No.

11566. Who gave them to you?—Mr. Laxton's brother brought them to me.

11567. Mr. Henry Laxton?—Yes.

11568. What did he say to you when he delivered them?—He said, here are those shares; and I threw them upon the shelf, and said, "Oh, very well."

11569. You have never paid anything for them?—No.

11570. Are you able to pay 2,500 *l.*?—It would put me to great inconvenience; I have no doubt I could do it, if compelled to do it, in the course of time.

11571. Did you know you were liable for 2,500 *l.* at the time you signed?—No, certainly not, not legally liable.

Lunæ, 1° *die Maii*, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *William Laxton*, again called in; and Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson*.

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

1 May 1837.

11571*. A NEWSPAPER was shown to you on Saturday, containing an advertisement and prospectus of the City Railway?—Yes.

11572. And you stated, in answer to a question I put to you, that an advertisement appeared, describing the South London Union Railway, which, for the reasons you gave to me, you considered emanated from the same parties as the Southampton Company?—Yes.

11573. Is that the newspaper that contains the advertisement to which you referred?—Yes.

[*The Witness delivered in the Newspaper containing the following Advertisement:*]

"THE SOUTH LONDON UNION RAILWAY.

"Capital £. 600,000, in 12,000 shares, at £. 50 each.

"*Provisional Committee*:—George Brett, esq., Thomas Harrison, esq., Colonel Henderson, William Hill, esq., Robert Monro, esq., Sir T. Roberts, bart., Josiah Towne, esq., James Whitchurch, esq.; with power to add to their number.

"*Bankers*:—Messrs. Spooner, Attwood & Co., Gracechurch-street; Messrs. Wright & Co., Henrietta-street, Covent-garden.

"*Solicitors*:—Messrs. Few, Hamilton & Few.

"*Engineer*:—Francis Giles, esq.

"*Surveyor*:—T. Marsh Nelson, esq.

"The South London Union Railway, to be constructed on the well-known principle of a viaduct, is intended to commence near the terminus of the London and Greenwich Railway, near London Bridge, passing in its course the Southwark, Blackfriars, Waterloo and Westminster Bridges, and Vauxhall Gardens, to a depôt at or near its western terminus above Vauxhall Bridge, whence it will run into the Southampton Railway now in progress; from which railways are projected to lead to Dover, Brighton, Portsmouth and Exeter. The sources whence the revenue of the South London Union is expected to arise, are not only the goods and passengers' traffic now existing between London and Vauxhall Bridges, but the traffic upon the London and Southampton Railway, and the other lines of railway projected to lead thereout to Dover, Brighton, Portsmouth and Exeter, which shall arrive at or

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

1 May 1837.

depart from the metropolis. The South London Union Railway will thus form the three first miles of the railway communication between London and the whole southern coast of England, including not only the ports of Dover, Shoreham, Portsmouth and Southampton, but also those favourite places of resort, Epsom, Dorking, Brighton, Tunbridge Wells, and the Isle of Wight. The formation of docks at Southampton, and the establishment of a steam-navigation station at that port, as now projected, will doubtless add considerably to the traffic on this railway. The concurrence of several of the principal proprietors in the neighbourhood of the line has been obtained. A deposit of 1 *l.* per share will be required within 10 days after the appropriation of the shares, for which an early day will be named, and another 1 *l.* per share on the 20th of January 1837; and it is intended that each shareholder shall receive interest at the rate of four per cent. per annum upon the amount paid up, from the date of obtaining the Royal Assent to the Bill, until the railway, or some part of it, is in action. The liability of the shareholders will be limited to the amount of subscription; and no call will be made exceeding 5 *l.* per share at any one time, and a period of three months will intervene between every call.

" Applications for shares and prospectuses to be made (post paid) to the bankers, and Messrs. Few, Hamilton & Few, Covent-garden."

11574. You told my learned friend, Mr. Hill, that applications came in very freely from persons applying for shares, upon the promulgation of your scheme?—Yes.

11575. Shall you be able to identify any letters I shall put into your hands, as the letters of the applicants received on that occasion?—Yes, I shall.

A letter, signed William Burnett, was handed to the Witness, dated 9th March 1836, directed to the Secretary of the City of London Railway, and identified by him as one of the applications made, being for 40 shares.

11576. For how many shares is that letter you have in your hand?—For 40 shares.

11577. Be so good as to look at the indorsement upon the letter, and tell the Committee the determination of the directors upon the subject?—It is indorsed, " Right, 40 shares."

11578. Does that mean that 40 shares were allowed to that applicant?—It means the number of shares contained in the application, and then under that, is " got 20."

11579. What does that mean?—The number of shares to be allotted. I think this word " got 20 " has been written subsequently, but I cannot speak positively to that.

11580. Are you able to say whether the applicant received 20 or 40, or any number of shares, or some other person, in respect of that letter?—I cannot speak to that, from this letter; there is another letter which states it.

11581. The letter of appropriation?—Yes.

Mr. *Beetham* suggested, that this information had better be given by the secretary.

Witness.] I filled these up myself, many of them.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that any person who could give any explanation should be called, if the Committee wished it, at any period of the inquiry.

[*Another Letter was handed to the Witness.*]

11582. Is that the letter of appropriation?—Yes.

11583. How many shares were appropriated to that party?—Twenty shares.

11584. The original application being for 40?—Yes.

11585. Is there any signature at the back of Mr. Burnett's letter, to denote that he received the scrip?—

The *Chairman* suggested, whether this information could not be furnished by means of a return, and that the more important part of the matter appeared to be, to show that inquiries were made as to the parties whose circumstances had been brought under the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that his object was to show that the parties, as to whom so much inquiry had been made, were parties who had applied for shares in the regular way.

The *Chairman* stated, that it appeared to him that all the information that was now offered, could be furnished to the Committee in a return, specifying the names of the parties, the time of the applications, the number of shares for which they applied, and the result of the application.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, he should adopt the suggestion, and act upon it

at

at once; it being understood that the return should be prepared and put in by a person of whom any explanation might be asked, which appeared to be necessary.

11586. You were questioned by my learned friend, Mr. Hill, on Saturday, upon the subject of the calculations and the engineering difficulties of the scheme contemplated; with respect to the calculations, are those calculations correct?—Yes, they are.

11587. Have they been gone over with care, for the purpose of seeing that they were so?—They have all been gone into and minutely analyzed in every way, to ascertain the true qualities and value of the property.

11588. Does it appear to you there are difficulties of any importance, in an engineering point of view, in the line proposed to be taken by this company?—Certainly not; it is a dead level nearly the whole distance; and it will be a series of arches, one after the other, except the bridge over the Thames.

11588.* *Chairman.*] One of your difficulties is that of the bridge over the Thames?—Yes.

11589. What experience have you had, in your practice as a building surveyor, in any work of such magnitude as a bridge over the Thames?—First, I have consulted various parties upon the best mode of construction, and examined several bridges that have been constructed in London; and during their progress for the last five years, I have been almost constantly engaged in examining all the large works going on about London: it is the profession of a surveyor to estimate bridges as well as buildings, and I may safely say that all the large contracts taken in the last 12 months have been estimated by surveyors for the railway projects.

11590. Do you not think the construction of such a bridge requires a knowledge of principles which do not usually form a part of the education of a building surveyor?—I have also submitted the estimates and drawings to Mr. Hosking.

11591. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Is he an engineer of considerable experience?—Yes.

11592. Where does he live?—Woburn-square.

11593. Is he the engineer to the Birmingham, Bristol and Thames Junction Railway?—He is.

11594. Is he a gentleman of considerable experience and sagacity in these matters?—Yes.

11595. What was the result of his inspection of the line, and the difficulty of the operations?—He approves of the whole of the line, and is ready to support the estimates before the Committee.

11596. Before the Committee on the Bill?—Yes; and also Mr. Blunt, who was at that time in connexion with me. He had been in Mr. Rennie's employ during the time London Bridge was in progress; the calculation was made jointly by us, and I had the correct particulars of the whole of the quantities connected with that bridge, the coffer-dams and the centres; and we were prepared before the Committee to enter into every explanation regarding the value.

11597. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Can you tell me what is the amount of deposit paid into the bank?—£. 19,166.

11598. Upon how many shares?—I do not know exactly the number of shares, but that is the amount paid in.

11599. Does this card contain a statement of what you call the reasons in favour of the Bill, showing the distances on the line over which you propose to go [*handing a card to the Witness*]?—Yes, it does.

[*The Witness delivered in the Card, as follows:*]

"City of London Railway Company, from Southwark Bridge to the Hammersmith Road.

"Reasons in favour of the Bill:—

"First, because it will be of great public advantage to open an expeditious, cheap, and better mode of communication between a convenient central part of the metropolis and all the bridges, commencing at Southwark Bridge, and joining the termini of the Birmingham, the Bristol, and the Southampton Railways, now in progress, and Stevenson's Brighton, and other railways now in contemplation.

"Second, because it will save time and expense in conveying goods from the several termini above named to the city.

"Third, because it will lessen the traffic through the already over-crowded streets.

"Fourth, because it will be the only railway connecting the aforesaid railway with the River Thames, the docks and the city.

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

1 May 1837.

" Distances of the present Metropolitan Railways with the City:

" The Birmingham Railway	-	-	2½ miles.
The Great Western	-	-	4¼ —
The Southampton	-	-	3½ —

" Fifth, because the proposed City of London Railway offers no engineering difficulties.

" Sixth, because the many millions of money which have been expended in constructing the above-mentioned railways will be rendered comparatively unavailable to the public, unless their respective termini be more immediately connected with the metropolis itself, which the proposed Bill, if passed into a law, will effect.

" City of London Railway Company, for effecting a junction of the Birmingham, Great Western, Southampton, proposed Brighton, Portsmouth, the Eastern, North, and South-western Railways, with the Metropolis and the River Thames from Southwark Bridge to Hammersmith Road.

" *Deputation:*—Mr. Dakeyne.

" Committee-rooms, Exchequer Coffee-house, New Palace-yard, Westminster."

11600. Have you got a list of the number of original applicants for shares, to whom shares were allotted?—Eight hundred and eighty-nine applicants.

11601. And the number of shares applied for?—Twenty-three thousand one hundred and fifty-three; the number of allotted shares 17,051.

11602. Does that list contain any of the persons who applied for shares, and who were refused them?—Yes, it does.

11603. What is the number of persons who applied for shares, and to whom no shares were allotted?—One hundred and sixty-five.

11604. Can you furnish to the Committee the number of persons to whom the 17,051 shares were, in fact, allotted?—It is here stated.

11605. Can you furnish to the Committee the number of persons who paid deposits upon those shares?—The whole paid deposits.

11606. *Chairman.*] Upon the whole 17,051?—No. I misunderstood your question; you wish to ascertain what number of those parties have paid the deposits?—Yes.

11607. Yes?—I am not able to say that.

The Witness was directed to furnish the information the next time the Committee met.

11608. Mr. *Clarkson.*] What is the number of shares that have been actually paid deposits upon?—Eight thousand seven hundred and fifty-one.

11609. There are, besides those 8,751, many depositors who have paid, but are not subscribers to the deed?—Yes, there are several.

11610. Can you tell the Committee the amount of those depositors beyond the 8,751?—No, I cannot speak with accuracy to that.

11611. Can you tell me the amount paid by persons who have not subscribed the deed?—The total amount paid is 19,166 *l.*

11612. That shows a difference between the depositors who have signed the deed and those who have not?—Yes.

11613. Amongst the list of subscribers to that deed, are there, to your know ledge, besides the directors, persons of eminence in the world, and of considerable fortune?—Yes.

11614. You stated in your examination by my learned friend, that the Honourable Warwick Lake, the present Lord Lake, was a director?—Yes.

11615. Do you know whether he was a director in compliance with a request of his own?—Yes, he was.

[*A Letter was handed to the Witness.*]

11616. Is that the letter you received from Mr. Lake?—Yes

[*The Witness produced the same.*]

" Sir, Chertsey, 28th February 1836.

" I received yours this morning, enclosing a prospectus of the City Railway, and requesting me to become a director of same; should you think my name would add to its success you are welcome to make use of it.

" I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

" To F. Beetham, esq. *W. Lake.*"
&c. &c. &c."

11617. In what manner is it proposed to pay this capital, provided the Bill is obtained?—By instalments, not exceeding 10 *l.* at each time, and at intervals of not less than three months.

11618. £.10 *l.* per share, you mean?—Yes.

11619. That

1619. That is the proposed maximum?—Yes, it is.

11620. Do you happen to know whether the corporations of the Birmingham Railway, the Great Western Railway, and the several proposed Brighton Railways are favourable to this undertaking?—I understand that they are all favourable; that is to say, Stephenson's Brighton; I cannot speak to the other Brightons, because we had no connexion with them.

11621. Have the Corporation of London intimated their assent?—They have assented to the bridge passing over the Thames.

11622. That is such part as concerns them?—Yes.

11623. You spoke on Saturday of a junction, not only contemplated, but arrangements completed, between the Bristol and Grand Junction Company with you?—Yes, there has been an arrangement.

11624. Supposing this project to be abandoned, what distance will the city be from the London terminus of the Great Western Railway?—About four miles and a half from the Bank.

11625. What distance will it be from the Southampton and other railways that come towards London?—From the Birmingham it is two miles and a half, from the Great Western, four and a half, and from the Southampton about three miles.

11626. Have you yourself examined the bankers' book with a view to see whether all the shares have been actually subscribed for?—I have not gone into every individual share; I have taken the gross amount; and I believe there is not a single party on the deed but what has paid the deposits. I got my information from the secretary.

11627. Do you know whether Mr. Blunt has paid his deposits?—Yes, he has.

11628. Mr. Brown has been spoken of incidentally; do you know whether he has paid?—I believe he has, but I cannot speak so positively of him; but every one connected with the deed has paid a deposit.

11629. Now, speaking with the same degree of solemnity as if you were upon your oath, are you aware of any inducement of any indirect character used by those promoting this undertaking to procure the signature of an individual to the deed?—Decidedly not.

11630. Or do you know an instance in which any subscriber has been permitted to put his name for any number of shares for which the deposits have not been paid?—I do not know a single instance.

11631. Has it come to the knowledge of the directors, in the course of their pursuit of this measure, that one of their officers had been speculating in shares?—It did.

11632. What was the consequence of that communication to the directors, I do not want you to mention names; was the consequence of that communication the immediate discharge of the party?—It was.

11633. Have the kindness to explain to the Committee, without mentioning the name of the party, unless they desire it, what was the nature of the speculation?—Buying shares for time on the Exchange.

11634. *Chairman.*] Were the officers of the company prohibited having any dealings in the shares of the company?—There is no minute to that effect, but it was considered by the directors highly improper.

11635. Do not the transactions in which you yourself have been concerned, of holding shares by other parties, come within what you consider to be the rule laid down by the directors?—No; we did not speculate in them, and buy them for time.

11636. What is the rule; is it a prohibition to deal at all in the shares of the company, or to buy shares for time?—Buying shares for time.

11637. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do I understand you right, that the directors permitted the officers to take shares in the railway upon the supposition that they would be *bonâ fide* holders?—Certainly.

11638. They were not allowed to traffic in shares?—No, they were not.

11639. Your attention has been called to three several names, Mr. Gurney, Captain Langley and Mr. Drake, and we heard from one of the witnesses that Mr. Drake's present residence is Whitecross-street Prison?—Yes.

11640. Did you read the evidence given by a person of the name of Green, with respect to Mr. Drake?—Yes, I did.

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

1 May 1837.

11641. Did you, in consequence of what you found there disclosed, go on Saturday last to Whitecross-street Prison?—I did.

11642. Did you there see Mr. Drake?—Yes, I did.

11643. Did you find in the note of Mr. Green's examination, that he knew Francis Drake, and spoke to his handwriting [*the Deed was shown to the Witness*]?—Yes; here it is.

11644. Did you apply to Mr. Drake, with reference to the fact of his having signed the deed?—Yes, I did.

11645. Be so good as to state what Mr. Drake stated to you?—Mr. Drake stated, when I read over to him that part of Mr. Green's evidence, that he knew Mr. Drake's handwriting that was to the deed, he said it was a complete falsehood, "for, as it so happened, I did not sign my name at all to the deed, but it was signed by a gentleman."

11646. Give us the name?—I do not know the name: "residing at 107, Stamford-street."

11647. Was it Edmunds?—Yes; "who had signed it by his full authority, and that that person held the shares, who was worth at least 6,000*l.* a year, and who intended to hold them and pay up all instalments."

11648. Did you read that part of the supposed statement by Green to Mr. Drake which stated that Mr. Gurney belonged either to a gambling-house or was connected with gambling?—I did.

11649. What did Mr. Drake say in that respect?—Mr. Drake said it was entirely a falsehood; that he had known Mr. Gurney, but he never knew him to be in any way connected with gambling; he also stated he had an income of at least 500*l.* or 600*l.* a year by his wife.

11650. Did he say whether he had told Mr. Green that this Mr. Gurney was connected with a gambling-house?—He said most positively he had never stated anything of the kind.

11651. Did he state what Mr. Gurney's profession was?—He said he was a barrister.

11652. There was a statement made by Mr. Green, on the subject of Captain Langley, that he had gone away without paying his rent, and that he was connected with gambling?—Mr. Drake stated that he never knew Mr. Langley, and never heard of him.

11653. Or mentioned his name to Mr. Green?—Yes.

11654. Did you ask him whether he had spoken of Mr. Gurney, as being one of three persons, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Hamilton and Captain Langley, who had been connected with gambling transactions?—He said most decidedly not; that he never knew Mr. Gurney connected with gambling transactions.

11655. Did you ask him whether he had ever so stated to Mr. Green?—I did.

11656. What did he say?—That it was entirely false.

11657. Did you, from that inquiry, proceed to the house No. 4, Taunton-place, Regent's Park, to make inquiry about Captain Langley?—I did.

11658. Did you ascertain that Captain Langley had been the owner of that house?—I did.

11659. For what length of time?—He had been residing there three or four years; I am not sure whether he said five years.

11660. Did he appear to be a married man with a family?—Yes.

11661. Did you learn when he had left the house?—About the 11th of March last.

11662. Was the gentleman who then occupied the house a gentleman of the name of Newton?—Yes.

11663. Did you learn from Mr. Newton whether Captain Langley had left the house or neighbourhood in debt?—He said he had no idea that he left the neighbourhood in debt, for he had had no inquiries after him when he left; that when he took the house he inquired if all the rent and taxes had been paid up, and he found that they had.

11664. Do you happen yourself to be personally known to a person of the name Henry Collinson?—Yes, I do.

11665. Do you know the house No. 17, Bedford-place?—I do not know that house; I know where he resides now.

11666. Where?—No. 4, Brunswick-row, Queen-square.

11667. Do

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

1 May 1837.

11667. Do you happen to know that No. 17, Bedford-place, was a boarding-house?—I cannot speak to that house; I did not direct my inquiries to that house.

11668. He lives now in Brunswick-row?—Yes.

11669. Did he after live at 17, Bedford-place?—Yes, I understand he did.

11670. *Chairman.*] From whom?—I knew him some time ago; and to the best of my recollection, he then lived about Bedford-place; but I am not positive, for I do not know the house.

11671. Is he a respectable gentleman?—Yes, he is.

11672. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Are you able to tell the Committee—do not say that you are, if you are not—whether he is competent to fulfil his engagements for his shares in this undertaking?—As far as I could judge from appearances, I should say he was; I always considered him a very respectable young gentleman.

11673. What is he?—A person partly living upon his own income, and also a short-hand writer.

11674. Do you know whether Mr. Collinson is the actual holder of the shares for which he is a subscriber to the deed?—He told me, some time since, he held 20 shares of the City Railway.

11675. Now, Mr. Martin has been examined with reference to what passed between you upon the subject of his subscribing the deed and taking these shares for you; when you requested Mr. Martin to sign the deed, did you explain to him its nature?—Most decidedly I did.

11676. Have you yourself seen Mr. Martin since he gave his evidence before this Committee on Saturday?—I have.

11677. Have you had any explanation with him upon the subject of his evidence?—Yes, I have.

11678. What has been the result of your explanation?—In explanation to him of the conversation, he said he recollected there had been a previous conversation.

11679. Be so good as to tell the Committee what was the conversation you explained to Mr. Martin when you saw him on Saturday?—I said to Mr. Martin, "You must recollect, when I bring it to your mind, that, when we were sitting up-stairs together, I particularly asked you if you would do me the favour to sign the City Railway deed for 50 shares on my account?" He promised me he would. He said he would go the following morning; and subsequently, as he was leaving my residence, I again said to him, "You will not forget to call on Mr. Beetham, and sign the deed." He said, "You may depend upon it I will."

11680. Was that the whole of the conversation you explained to him?—He said, most likely he would call on me again this morning, and if it were necessary he would attend again before the Committee, and explain the conversation between us.

11681. Did he state to you he had a recollection of this previous conversation?—He said he had a faint recollection of something of the sort; and he had no doubt he should, between yesterday and this morning, be able to recollect the conversation, and should be happy to attend again and explain it.

11682. If the Committee wished it?—Yes.

11683. I questioned you on Saturday on the subject of a negotiation pending between this company and the Southampton; can you give me the date when that negotiation terminated?—I think the last letter, that concluded the negotiation, was dated February 10th.

11684. Of this year?—Yes; and subsequently to that, to the best of my recollection, a clause, drawn by the Southampton Railway people, was submitted to Mr. Beetham, to the best of my recollection.

11685. I believe it is upon the notes of the Committee, and I need only refer to it, that it was upon the 16th of March that Mr. Lill's petition was presented to the Committee on the Bill?—I cannot speak to that.

11686. Is this one of the prospectuses of the City Railway Company [*handing a Paper to the Witness*]?—Yes, it is. [*The same was handed in.*]

The re-examination of the Witness was postponed.

[The Witness withdrew.

R. Fillingham.

Robert Fillingham was called in; and Examined, as follows:

11687. Mr. *Bircham.*] WHERE do you reside?—No. 6, Gardiner's-terrace, Mile-end.

11688. You are a clerk in the office of Messrs. Lowless?—Yes.

[*A Deed was shown to the Witness.*]

R. Fillingham.

1 May 1837.

11689. Will you look at the signature of George Edward, G. E. Peacock, and tell the Committee whether you know his writing?—Yes, I know it.

11690. Is that his handwriting?—Yes.

11691. *Chairman.*] Is the word opposite "solicitor" or "solicitors"?—Solicitor.

11692. Mr. *Bircham.*] Is the whole of the line in his handwriting?—Yes; I should say it was, as far as "solicitor."

11693. Do you know where Mr. Peacock now is?—No, I do not.

11694. Do you know that he was convicted of forgery?—Yes, I do.

11695. You were present at the trial?—Yes.

11696. A witness for him?—Yes; I was not called.

11697. You know he has been transported in pursuance of his conviction?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

11698. You are a clerk to Messrs. Lowless & Cross?—No; Lowless & Son.

11699. They are eminent and respectable solicitors?—Yes, I believe so.

11700. Did Peacock, whose transportation has been prominentized upon this occasion, once have the honour of a connexion in partnership with one of the Messrs. Lowless?—Yes.

11701. Was he, up to that time, considered a person of great respectability?—Yes, I have always understood so.

11702. Was he a man whose name would have been taken in the profession for 1,000 *l.*?—I should say it was, at one time.

11703. *Chairman.*] What was the date of his conviction?—Really, I do not know.

11704. Mr. *Clarkson.*] It was sometime in the course of the latter part of last year?—Yes, I believe it was.

11705. Will you do me the favour to look at that letter of Mr. Peacock's [*handing one to the Witness*]; is that the handwriting of Mr. Peacock?—Yes.

11706. What date does it bear?—The 7th of March 1836.

[The Witness withdrew.

The *Chairman* inquired if Mr. Clarkson was ready to proceed with the cross-examination of Mr. Green or Mr. Stephens.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that an inquiry was on foot, upon the result of which would depend whether he should cross-examine those witnesses at considerable length or scarcely at all; and that he should not be able to decide upon that point till to-morrow; but that it would depend upon the nature of the rest of the evidence, called on the other side, whether he should think it necessary to cross-examine them at all.

The *Chairman* inquired whether the parties appearing in support of the Petitions were prepared to call any further witnesses.

Mr. *Bircham* stated he was not able to find either of the witnesses who had been summoned.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated he would, to save time, proceed with the cross-examination of Mr. Stephens; but afterwards suggested to the Committee that the parties promoting these Petitions ought to be prepared either to go on with their evidence, or close their case; and submitted that the present investigation was similar to a proceeding at *nisi prius.*

The *Chairman* stated, that the Committee would continue the examination as long as it appeared to them there were any material facts to be elicited.

Mr. *Clarkson* begged to remind the Committee, that the Committee on the Bill had this day adjourned for the seventh time, in consequence of these interlocutory proceedings.

Mr. *Felix Blunt*, called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. Felix Blunt.

11707. Mr. *Clarkson.*] HAVE you been in the room all the morning?—I have been in about half an hour.

11708. Mr. *Bircham.*] Have you heard your name mentioned?—No, I have not.

11709. You are a subscriber to this railway?—I have signed the deed.

11710. When did you sign the deed?—I think it was in the month of October.

11711. You took a distinction, when I asked you the question, between signing the deed and being a subscriber?—I merely signed the deed.

11712. Do you mean you did not sign it on your own behalf?—

Mr.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the question.

The question was waived.

11713. Mr. *Bircham.*] What do you mean by merely signing the deed?—I had no other connexion with the company but signing the deed.

11714. Did you pay the deposits?—I did not.

11715. Did you receive the shares?—Yes.

11716. When?—Some at that time, and some others were forwarded to me some short time afterwards.

11717. What number did you sign for?—Fifty shares.

11718. How many did you receive scrip for at that time?—I forget; I did not examine them.

11719. You say you received some of the shares then and some afterwards?—They were given to me wrapped up; and I did not examine them.

11720. *Chairman.*] Who gave them to you?—I forget; one of the clerks of the company; I forget who; I did not know him.

11721. Mr. *Bircham.*] When were the remainder of those shares sent to you?—About a fortnight afterwards.

11722. Were you asked by anybody to sign the deed?—Yes.

11723. By whom?—First, by my brother, and afterwards by Mr. Beetham.

11724. Which Mr. Beetham?—Mr. Francis Beetham.

11725. Will you state to the Committee what took place when you were asked by your brother?—My brother stated it was essential to the company to have a certain number of names attached to the deed, and requested me to sign for that purpose.

11726. Your brother was then the engineer of the company?—Yes.

11727. Was that all that took place between you and him?—Yes, that was all.

11728. What took place when Mr. Beetham asked you to sign the deed?—Nothing; merely asked me if I would sign the deed, and I said, yes.

11729. How long was this before you actually did sign it?—He asked me first about a week before I did sign it; and then again a few minutes before I signed it.

11730. Did any one tell you how many shares to sign for?—Yes; Mr. Beetham told me to sign for 50 shares.

11731. When was that?—At the time I signed.

11732. Had any one told you previously?—No, I do not recollect that anybody had.

11733. What age were you then, when you signed the deed?—Twenty-one and some months; I was 21 in the month of February of that year.

11734. What profession are you?—Engineer and architect.

11735. On your own account?—Yes.

11736. On your own account?—Yes.

11737. How long have you been in business?—About a twelvemonth.

11738. Do you consider yourself equal to the payment of 2,500 *l.*, the amount of your subscription to this deed?—No, I do not.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

11739. You have been asked whether Mr. Beetham told you to sign for 50 shares, and whether you recollected whether any one else told you the number you were to sign for before?—I do not recollect whether my brother did or did not state the number I should sign for before.

11740. You do not exactly recollect it?—No.

11741. At that time your brother was one of the engineers, or engineer, to the company?—Yes.

11742. Do you know, from your brother, whether he had paid the deposits upon the shares for which you signed?—I do not know.

11743. Have you ever asked?—No.

11744. Were you in the Committee-room when Mr. Laxton was examined just now?—A part of the time.

11745. Did you hear Mr. Laxton state that Mr. Blunt had paid up his deposits?—No, I did not.

11746. When you were requested by your brother to subscribe the deed, you knew you were doing it on his account, did you not?—No, I did not; I understood

Mr. *Felix Blunt.*

1 May 1837.

stood I was doing it on account of the company; my brother requested me to sign the deed to further the interests of the company; I certainly considered I was doing it for the company.

11747. You considered you were signing the deed for the company, in consequence of your brother desiring you to sign it, to further the interests of the company?—Yes.

11748. What has become of the shares you subscribed for?—I have got them now.

11749. How many?—Ten.

11750. When did you see your brother?—Last Saturday.

11751. Where did you see him?—At his office in Fleet-street.

11752. Is that your office too?—Yes.

11753. Are you in partnership together?—No.

11754. Do you carry on business at the same house?—In different parts of the same house; he has some part, and I have other part.

11755. Was he attending to his business on Saturday?—Yes.

11756. Have you seen him since Saturday?—I have not.

11757. Have you seen him this morning?—I have not.

11758. Do you live in the same house with him?—No, I do not.

11759. Do you not live in Fleet-street?—No.

11760. Where?—At Dartford, in Kent.

11761. Do you know whether he is very ill?—I do not; I am not aware that he was.

11762. You are not aware that he was?—No.

11763. There is nothing to prevent him travelling from Fleet-street to this place?—No.

11764. *Chairman.*] Is it your brother that writes this letter?—No, my father.

11765. Mr. *Clarkson.*] When did you see him last?—At a quarter to 12.

11766. What is the matter with him?—He is suffering under fever and cold, in consequence of waiting in the lobby here on Saturday.

11767. Is he attended by any medical man?—Yes.

11768. Who?—Mr. Forster, of Lambeth.

11769. Does your father live at Lambeth?—Yes, he does.

11770. Have you seen Mr. Forster this morning?—I have not.

11771. How long have you been in business for yourself?—About a twelvemonth.

11772. Is your father an architect too?—An architect and engineer.

11773. You say you have 10 shares; do you know, from your brother, that he has the other 40?—I have 10 pieces of parchment, each for 10 shares.

11774. Are those the first shares you have ever seen?—Yes, they are.

11775. You do not mean to say 10 pieces of parchment for 10 shares each?—Yes, to the best of my belief; but I have only looked at them once since I have had them.

11776. As you seem not to have examined them very critically, perhaps you could refer to them?—I have not them here.

11777. They are in town?—No; they are at Dartford; I keep my papers there; I live there.

11778. Do you come to town every day?—No, I come to town occasionally.

11779. Your brother was the engineer of the company?—Yes.

11780. He has been discharged?—He resigned, I believe.

11781. Resigned?—Yes.

11782. Was that because he was going to be discharged?—No, I believe not.

11783. I should like to know why; if you were not present, you do not know yourself, unless as your brother told you; do you mean to tell the Committee you do not know he resigned because he was about to be discharged?—I do not know.

11784. Why do you raise a distinction between his resignation and discharge?—From having seen his resignation announced in the public papers.

11785. Had that been preceded by an advertisement by the company?—I do not know; I had not seen it.

11786. Have you not reason to believe that your brother was discharged by the company, on account of his having taken away a receipt, their property?—No.

11787. Did you never hear it?—No.

11788. Did you ever know, or have you reason to believe, that the company advertised for a receipt he had taken away?—No, I did not.

11789. You never heard of it?—No.

11790. Are you upon terms of intimacy with your brother?—I am.

11791. Did he ever tell you he resigned?—No.

11792. Had you never the curiosity to ask him?—No.

11793. Do you know if your brother is upon terms with the company now?—I have not heard.

11794. Do you believe he is hostile to the interests of the company?—I have no reason to believe anything about it.

11795. Upon your honour have you not reason to believe that your brother is hostile to the interests of the company?—I have not.

11796. Have you never heard so from him?—No.

11797. Had you reason to believe that your brother was about to become a petitioner against the company?—Yes.

11798. What do you mean by that answer, connected with your previous statement, that he was not hostile to the company?—I have no further reason to believe so.

11799. Than what?—Than that he has petitioned against the company.

11800. On what ground?—I do not know.

11801. Have you seen the petition?—I have not.

11802. How do you know he contemplated petitioning against the company?—He said so yesterday.

11803. Yesterday?—On Saturday.

11804. Did he ever say so before?—I do not recollect that he did.

11805. Will you undertake to say that he did not?—No, I will not.

11806. Do you mean to represent you never heard from him, that he had been in collision with the company and their interests in consequence of his having taken away a receipt which the company alleged belonged to them?—No.

11807. You never heard it before?—Never.

11808. Then as you heard that your brother had resigned, did you hear why?—No further than what I learned from the advertisements in the papers.

11809. I suppose you saw the advertisement by accident?—Yes.

11810. You did not by accident see the advertisement for the receipt?—I did not see it at all.

11811. Have you been in attendance upon this Committee every day?—I was here on Saturday.

11812. Not before?—No.

11813. Who summoned you?—I really do not know; the subpœna is signed by Mr. Warburton.

11814. How did you first understand you were to be brought here as a witness?—By having a summons served.

11815. Did you not hear from your brother he had reason to believe you would be summoned?—No.

11816. When did you receive the summons?—On Friday night.

11817. That was the first time you heard that your services would be required on the part of the promoters of this petition?—Yes.

11818. Have you been attending this Committee on any other petition?—I was never here before last Saturday.

11819. Look at that paper [*handing one to the Witness*]; shall you be able to tell us whether you believe that to be his writing?—Yes.

11820. It is?—It is.

11821. Be so good as to read it; read it out?—"Gentlemen, I beg to inform you, in compliance with your request, that in consideration of my being paid 112*l.* this day, to meet the claims upon me for work and labour executed for the City of London Railway Company, I am content to let the balance, 224*l.*, remain until the Bill for the incorporation of the company shall have gone through Parliament. I beg further to say, that should any error have crept into the estimates, as regards the question of one or more bridges being required, I pledge myself to remedy it, by furnishing such plans or estimates as may have been omitted or misstated, together with all plans, attendances, estimates and evidence which the progress of the Bill may require, or which the Board may

Mr. *Felix Blunt.*

1 May 1837.

from time to time deem necessary and expedient. I am, gentlemen, your most obedient, &c., Charles John Blunt.—*P. S.* As regards the shares, amounting to 560*l.*, I beg to state that my friends agree to hold them, and under no circumstances to take them into the market, and to this I guarantee myself that they shall not. I have now to receive 112 shares, my friends having signed the deed for 88. C. J. B." Dated 9, Mansion-house-street, December 3d, 1836; addressed to the chairman of directors.

11822. After having read that paper, have you any doubt, upon your honour, that those shares you took were part of those shares?—I do not know that they had any connexion with him.

11823. Do you not believe it?—No, I do not; I believe I signed for the company.

11824. Do you believe the shares you took were taken on account of your brother?—No, I do not; I believe that they were not.

11825. Why?—Because he told me so.

11826. When did he tell you so?—When he asked me to sign.

11827. He told you that they were not on his account?—He told me it was for the company.

11828–29. Did he tell you it was not on his account?—In that way.

11830. Did he tell you it was not on his account?—He did not.

11831. How long has your brother been an engineer and architect?—I cannot exactly say; 10 or 12 years.

11832. Do you consider him a person competent to form estimates for a railway?—Perfectly.

11833. Perhaps you consider yourself competent too?—I do.

11834. Is your brother a man of considerable practice in his business?—He is.

11835. Has he had the management and conduct of very many important concerns?—He has.

11836. The first time you ever heard of your being examined here was by receiving a summons last Friday?—Yes.

11837. Have you ever given a note of your examination to any one?—No.

11838. Do you know how Mr. Bircham got down upon paper that which he examined you from just now?—No, I do not.

11839. You did not expect a little job from the Southampton Company?—No, I do not.

Re-examined by Mr. *Bircham.*

11840. You read a paper which spoke of 560*l.*; can you give any explanation what that alludes to?—No.

11841. Can you tell us who are the subscribers for the 200 shares your brother alludes to?—No.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Bircham*, in reply to a question from the Chairman, stated, he did not intend to impugn any of the country subscriptions.

Mr. *Daniel Edward Stephens*, again called in; and Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson*, as follows:

Mr. *D. E. Stephens.*

11842. I USED a harsh expression towards you personally, incidentally, and I am sorry for it.—I am obliged to you for retracting it; I thought at the time you ought to have done it.

11843. You have not asked for any retraction, it is voluntary. You have given an account to the Committee of some important speculations in which you have been concerned?—I am not aware of having given any such evidence of any important speculations.

11844. They were speculations that were of no importance?—What do you allude to?

11845. The different companies you belonged to as director. I do not mean in your examination here, but in your previous examination some days ago?—If you will refer to the evidence, I will answer any question.

11846. Have you, or have you not, been concerned in speculations of any importance before you set out to inquire into other people's characters?—Not any importance at all; I do not deem them of any importance.

11847. Bubbles?—

11847. Bubbles?—No, nothing of the kind; they are quite at an end.

11848. Did they ever have a beginning, except in your imagination and invention?—One was commenced, the Gravesend and Strood, but dropped, and not carried on, to which I was secretary, and of which Dr. Graham, a director of the City Railway, was himself the first promoter; he was the individual, with one or two of his friends put in the direction, who prevented the shares being sent out; there was an application for 28,500, and they would not allow them to be sent out; they kept them back, and they directed me and Mr. Green to go round to all the stockbrokers in the neighbourhood of the Royal Exchange, and send the stockbrokers into the market at one and the same time to buy up the shares, if they could, at a premium, on their coming out; and they stationed Stokes, with his friend Henry Cook, in the market, to see what was going forward, and be ready with 4,510 shares reserved, to issue them in case they could do it at a premium.

11849. You think it an answer to my question to seek to libel a man in his absence?—That is one company.

11850. I asked you about them, to see your connexion with them?—It is one of them; and, for the expenses I was at, I had to sue the directors.

11851. What was your avocation in life before you had the good fortune to stumble on companies?—I was formerly a ship-owner and a ropemaker.

11852. How long is it since you were a shipowner?—I was a shipowner till the conclusion of the war in 1815; I was in business long previous to that as a ropemaker.

11853. What business have you been in since that time?—As a ropemaker up to 1830 or 1831; it was about 1831.

11854. Did you then close the concern?—I let my premises very advantageously, and the man pays me the rent.

11855. Did you close your business?—There are some debts standing out in the books.

11856. Did you close the business?—I gave it up.

11857. To whom?—To my own tenant.

11858. Who is he?—Richard Cooper Grey.

11859. Where does he live?—In Stamford-street, in the Borough.

11860. Where was the business carried on?—In the Commercial-road.

11861. Whereabouts?—Opposite Stepney Causeway; and the premises stand now where they did then.

11862. Does he carry on the business?—He does; and his brother with him.

11863. You gave it up to him?—Yes, I did.

11864. For any consideration?—No; he understood——

11865. For nothing?—He did business on commission for me some time after.

11866. What have you been doing since that?—Living upon my wife's property, and what we have besides.

11867. Not requiring any business for your support?—No.

11868. You live at Chingford?—Yes.

11969. Are you a magistrate of the county?—No.

11870. Whereabouts at Chingford?—In the parish of Chingford.

11871. Whereabouts?—Between the Church and Chingford-green.

11872. Have you lived there since 1831?—I have lived there three years.

11873. Where did you live after you gave up your business?—I lived at Stepney-green about 13 years, till I left off business there; I then continued to live there till I went to Chingford.

11874. Do I understand you to represent to the Committee that you have been from that time till you were connected with this railway living upon your means, and your means only?—Yes; and I never was connected with any railway before the commencement of last year, or any public company whatever.

11875. But were living upon your wife's fortune, at Chingford?—Yes.

11876. When were you first invited to make any inquiries as to anybody's character, with Mr. Green?—I think it was about the latter part of February; the middle of February.

11877. Who invited you?—Mr. Parkes.

11878. Did you consider that the occupation or employment of a gentleman living upon his fortune?—It is quite immaterial; I had nothing at all to do; and I might be as well actively employed one way as another.

Mr. *D. E. Stephens.*

1 May 1837.

11879. As long as the engagement was an active one, you did not care what it was?—As long as I was actively engaged, it was quite immaterial to me.

11880. Did you receive any remuneration for it?—I might as well ask you whether you receive any remuneration with your brief.

11881. But I shall not answer you, and you shall answer me?—Then the question shall be put through the Chairman.

11882. *Chairman.*] You had better answer it?—I have not received any remuneration from Mr. Parkes yet; I have only received my expenses.

11883. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You were too much of a gentleman to make any arrangement about remuneration?—No arrangement was made.

12884. Were you too much of a gentleman to take any?—Whatever he pleases to give me, I shall be very happy to take.

11885. And add it to your fortune?—It is immaterial to you.

11886. Do you expect anything?—I do not know that I am bound to answer what my expectancies are.

11887. Would you have done the work, if you had not any?—I do not know that I am bound to answer that.

11888. If you do not like it, I will not press it. Did you do it for the love of public justice, or as a hired menial?—I do not know that I am bound to answer that.

11889. Did you do it as an hired menial, or as a gentleman living upon his fortune?—Certainly not as the first.

11890. What amount of money have you received for what you call expenses?—I cannot answer that, because I have not the accounts.

11891. About how much?—I cannot tell.

11892. How have you received it; per week or day, or month, or what?—Whatever small expenses I was at for cab-hire, he paid me.

11893. Did you go about the streets in a cab to make these inquiries?—Yes; sometimes I went into the country 10 or 15 miles.

11894. How long have you known Mr. Green?—A year and a half, or better.

11895. Is he a gentleman of fortune?—I know nothing of his circumstances.

11896. Do you know the Rotunda and the Royal Exchange?—I have been past the Royal Exchange.

11897. Do you know the Rotunda?—I never transacted business there.

11898. Do you know the Stock Exchange?—I never transacted business there, and was never on it; I know the locality.

11899. Have you been intimate with Mr. Green before the last year and a half?—I was joint-secretary with him to the Gravesend and Strood, as I told you before.

11900. Was that the company you spoke of; "Daniel Edward Stephens, esq., director of the Maidstone Railway; capital, 2,000,000*l.*?"—No, it was the Gravesend; that was never carried into effect, or brought out; there was never a share issued.

11901. There might be a very good reason for it?—There were applications for 5,000 shares.

11902. Is that the company in which you libelled Dr. Graham?—No; he was a director in the Gravesend.

11903. You are Daniel Edward Stephens, esq., a contemplated director?—My name is to it.

11904. I think it was about last February you first directed your attention to these inquiries?—Yes.

11905. In consequence of an invitation from Mr. Parkes?—Yes.

11906. Was Mr. Parkes an acquaintance of yours?—He became an acquaintance of mine then.

11907. Was he an acquaintance of yours before that?—Only by name; I have seen his name in the public prints, as a public character; a man very highly respected.

11908. So he might have seen yours, Daniel Edward Stephens, esq.?—He might.

11909. Did he become acquainted with you; was the acquaintance at his instance?—I can hardly answer that, except that it happened mutually.

11910. Did you meet together accidentally and shake hands?—I met him at his office.

11911. How

11911. How did you know his office?—It is easily known by looking at the Directory.

11912. Why did you go there?—I do not know that I am bound to answer that question.

11913. Yes, you are; did you go to Mr. Parkes's office for employment?—No, I did not go for employment.

11914. What for, then?—To have communications with him upon the Deptford and Dover Railway.

11915. Were you director, secretary or banker of that company?—No, I had nothing to do with it.

11916. What had you to do with it at Mr. Parkes's?—I will just read the evidence I gave before the Committee.

11917. I am not about to allow you to give yourself a character. Answer my question; did Mr. Parkes solicit your acquaintance, or you solicit his?—Mr. Parkes is close by; he can give an answer.

11918. You are to answer it?—I cannot say which it was; whether there was any solicitation one way or the other.

11919. Did you seek him, or he seek you?—I went to his office.

11920. Had you seen him or spoken to him before?—I do not know that I ever had any communication with him before.

11921. On that occasion did you not volunteer to lend him your assistance for certain substantial gratuities?—I certainly volunteered my services, but no gratuity was named.

11922. You being a gentleman, living at Chingford, and on your wife's fortune, volunteered your services to him, having no connexion with the company?—Yes.

11923. Do you mean to represent to the Committee you volunteered your services upon that or any other occasion without the contemplation of being paid?—There was not a word said about payment.

11924. There may not be any occasion for it to certain people?—There may not be to you.

11925. Was there none contemplated?—I cannot speak to contemplation.

11926. You cannot say whether you contemplated being paid?—There was a certain expense, and whatever expenses were incurred were to be paid.

11927. That might include the support of the inquirer, which a gentleman of fortune did not want; did you contemplate getting anything for yourself?—Not a word was said about it.

11928. Never mind that, did you not mean to make a profit of your inquiries or evidence?—Certainly not.

11929. Do you mean to do so now?—I shall only expect to be paid for my services, that is, my time and attendance.

11930. You have let it out?—Not with Mr. Parkes, but with Mr. Bircham.

11931. You expect to be paid for your time and attendance?—Not with Mr. Parkes; there was no understanding of the kind.

11932. Did Mr. Bircham intimate to you that the public would bleed very freely?—No engagement was entered into with Mr. Bircham, except that the expenses I was at should be paid, but not one farthing for services. If that is taken down in evidence, I beg it may be corrected.

11933. Do you mean only that no stipulation was made for services, or did you expect nothing?—Not a word was said.

11934. What do you expect; come now, a gentleman of fortune can have no difficulty in answering it?—You had better drop the words gentleman of fortune, it is wasting your breath.

11935. I will not use it any more; do you expect to get anything?—All the expenses out of pocket.

11936. What do you expect to get per day?—I cannot say; if I was paid one half what you get, I shall think myself very well paid.

11937. I am afraid you will not get that; I am a gentleman of fortune; how much will satisfy you?—Very little will satisfy me.

11938. A guinea a week?—I shall leave it entirely to himself.

11939. What will satisfy you?—I shall leave it to himself; that will satisfy me.

11940. Whatever it is?—Yes.

Mr. *D. E. Stephens.*

1 May 1837.

11941. A guinea, or five?—Yes; I do not care what it is.

11942. Whatever Mr. Bircham gives you out of the public pocket you will be satisfied with?—Yes.

11943. Do you know of an association, either formed or contemplated, called the Cocheau Bamboo Mining Association?—I never heard of such a thing.

11944. Or anything like it?—No; I have had 300 or 400 prospectuses through my hands in the last month, and never heard of it.

11945. Do they send them to you at Chingford?—No; I have seen them in town; I was inspecting, at a gentleman's office, a number of prospectuses; but I did not see that.

11946. What office was it?—That is of no consequence to you.

11947. I should like to know?—No, you will not.

11948. What gentleman let you come to his offices to inspect prospectuses?—I shall not answer that.

Mr. *Clarkson* appealed to the Committee, and requested the question might be put.

The *Chairman* stated the question should be put, if Mr. Clarkson considered it an important question.

11949. Did you ever hear of the Vachor Gold Mining Company?—No.

11950. Were you ever concerned in the West Weal Hove Mining Company?—I bought some shares in it, or applied for them.

11951. Which do you mean?—I applied for them, and got 20, and paid 20 *l.* for them; it was owing to Mr. Charles Toplis being a director in the West Weal Hove, and being a brother director of Dr. Graham, a director of the Strood and Gravesend.

11952. Were you connected with the company?—No.

11953. Have you got the shares?—No; the party to whom I sold them gave a bill for them; he was one of the directors of the West Weal Hove, and I took his bill for them, rather than have anything to do with them.

11954. Have you ever had anything but the bill for them?—No.

11955. Did you buy them in the market?—No; they were allotted to me.

11956. How long ago was it?—The spring or summer of last year; I do not recollect which it is; in May last year, or June.

11957. You have spoken somewhat at large of a person of the name of Chamberlain, in your previous examination?—If you will refer to it; I do not carry in my memory every word I said.

11958. You were examined at length?—I believe I was.

11959. Perhaps you are not quite sure?—The short-hand writer can refer to it.

11960. There is no occasion for that; did you ever borrow any shares of Mr. Chamberlain?—Five shares in the West Weal Hove, and I paid him for them.

11961. First tell us when you borrowed them?—It was in the autumn of the year.

11962. What year?—Last year.

11963. Did you pay for them when you had borrowed them?—No; I have paid him for them since, the price he fixed upon them.

11964. Could not you get them in any other way?—I do not know.

11965. What did you do with them afterwards?—Sold them.

11966. You borrowed his shares?—Yes, and sold them at the same price I bought them.

11967. Had you any authority from him to sell them?—Yes; I borrowed them for the very purpose to add to my own 20; I had sold 25 to Mr. John Leigh Stevens, one of the proprietors of the Eastern Counties; I had sold him 30; I had only 25, and borrowed the five to make up the 30, with the promise of having five from another friend, to restore to Mr. Chamberlain, of whom I knew very little; but not getting them, Mr. Chamberlain said, "You can pay me for them;" and I paid him 25*s.* for them, to which they had then fallen; and you may now buy them at 6*d.*

11968. Did you pay for them by instalments, or at once?—I paid him as he wanted it; I paid him 10*s.* at first, and the rest as he wanted it.

11969. When did you pay the 10*s.*?—I cannot say.

11970. How

11970. How long after you borrowed them?—About three or four weeks; I had given every farthing he asked for them.

11971. Why did you not give him the whole money at once?—Perhaps I had no change; I might not.

11972. You had just 10*s.* in change?—I had half a sovereign I gave him.

11973. Do you recollect whether you had any more change?—No, I have paid him the 25*s.*; that will suffice you.

11974. No, it will not; when did you pay him anything else on account?—I cannot recollect.

11975. To the best of your recollection?—He has been paid.

11976. Did you pay him by certain instalments?—By no instalments; just as I had silver in my pocket.

11977. He was a man that could afford to give credit?—No, he was not.

11978. You were a gentleman of fortune?—You had better drop that term, or else I might ask you about your father and the rest of the family in Essex-street.

11979. How many instalments did it take before you paid the 25 *s.*?—No instalments whatever; whenever I fell in with him, he asked me for half-a-crown or 5*s.* or 10 *s.*, just as he wanted it, and I gave a person on his behalf 5*s.* and 10*s.* before, and, I think, 10*s.* afterwards.

11980. Do you mean to represent to the Committee that you paid for these five shares you borrowed, in that way at the instigation of or with the consent of Chamberlain, or that you did it because you said you had no other means of doing it?—I never uttered such a word; I deny it unequivocally.

11981. Do you mean to state you paid him in the small sums you have described with his consent?—Yes, most certainly, or he would have had his money sooner.

11982. He might have had it when he liked?—Yes.

11983. He had no occasion to ask you for it more than once?—If he had pressed for it, he might have had it; the shares were of no value; I did not get the shares from him; he had left them in the hands of Mr. Dandridge; I was to pay him; it was not Chamberlain, it was a man of the name of Dandridge I was to have paid.

11984. You had them from a man you did not pay at all, and the man you did not have them from you paid the money by instalments?—I had them from Dandridge, not from Chamberlain.

11985. Did you ever pay Dandridge?—No; I paid 10*s.* the first time he asked me for it; as soon as the price was agreed upon, I was to pay him 25 *s.* I paid him 10*s.*, and the same day 5*s.* to a person on his behalf.

11986. Who was that?—Poulton.

11987. Is that Mr. Green's acquaintance?—I do not know; he is Benjamin Wheeler Poulton.

11988. Is he an acquaintance of yours?—I know very little of the man now.

11989. Is he a man that hunts into people's characters?—I do not know of my own knowledge.

11990. Now I must have an answer to this question. Do you mean to say you paid Chamberlain in the manner you have described, with his consent and concurrence, or only because Chamberlain could get it from you in no other way?—I mean to say it was not because he could not get in any other way; if he had taken the trouble to go to Mile-end any week, where I collect rents, he could have had it immediately, and where I have been building.

11991. He had never occasion to press you?—No, I gave it him as he asked for it.

11992. Do you give me that answer with the same solemnity as if you were upon your oath?—I do.

11993. How did you get the other five shares that made up the 25?—That is nothing to you. I paid the company 20*l.*; I paid into the bankers 20*l.*, and bought the other five.

11994. Where did you get the other five?—I bought them.

11995. Who from?—A person in the market.

11996. From whom?—I cannot recollect; suffice it to say, I delivered them. To the best of my recollection, it was Thomas Green; I paid him for them.

11997. Thomas Green, your brother secretary?—Yes.

11998. You have had some shares in this West Weal Hove, and you have been a director of the Maidstone Junction, with Mr. Green, the secretary, but

Mr. *D. E. Stevens.*

1 May 1837.

you know nothing of the Cocheau Bamboo Mining Company, or the Vashar Gold Mining Company?—No.

11999. Did you ever hear of the Plata Peruvian Mining Company?—No, I never heard of that.

12000. The Terra Platina Gold Mining Company?—I never heard of it.

12001. Do you know a person of the name of Warman?—I never heard of the name.

12002. Now did you make any inquiry with reference to a person of the name of Langley?—Yes, I did.

12003. At whose instance did you make it?—Mr. Bircham's.

12004. When did you first become employed by Mr. Bircham?—I think it was after the Deptford and Dover was done with.

12005. Where did you inquire with respect to Mr. Langley?—At Taunton-place, Regent's Park.

12006. On what day?—I have not the date down here; it is since Good Friday.

12007. Whom did you see?—There was a female opened the door, and referred me to 54, George-street, Hampstead-road.

12008. Did you go there?—Yes, and got no information at all; I beg your pardon, I got information there that we should find him in the Poultry, at an office in the city.

12009. Did you obtain any information of or concerning Captain Langley, except that which you obtained of him?—I saw himself.

12010. Did you obtain any information of him from any one else?—A person of the name of Drake, in Whitecross-street prison, said if we would go down to a person of the name of Bozon, who was at the office of the city solicitor —

12011. Mr. Hobler?—Yes, if we would go to Mr. Hobler's office we should find a Mr. Bozon there; we did go there, and we found Mr. Bozon had gone to Union-court; we followed him there, and there Drake gave us to understand we should get information of Mr. Gurney, as well as Captain Langley.

12012. I am speaking of Captain Langley; you say you went to Drake; did Drake give you any information of Captain Langley?—He said he had no doubt Mr. Bozon would give us any information.

12013. Did he give you any information?—He mentioned the name, but knew nothing of his circumstances.

12014. Did he say whether he knew the man?—To the best of my recollection he did.

12015. Will you say he did?—I did not write it down at the time; I will not swear to it.

12016. Will you undertake to say he knew the man?—He said he knew the name of the gentleman, and also if we went to Mr. Bozon's office, we should hear of him, and he is here, and that will save your time.

12017. Anything else did he say in regard to Captain Langley?—I did not commit to writing what he said respecting Langley, because I had had an interview with Captain Langley himself, and I thought it useless.

12018. You did not get any more information from Mr. Drake than what you have stated?—No.

12019. Did you inquire of him for Mr. Gurney?—We asked him for the address.

12020. Did you inquire of any one else about Mr. Gurney?—We inquired of Drake, and Drake referred us to Mr. Bozon.

12021. Did Drake give you any information about Mr. Gurney?—No, he did not; he said something about him, but I did not commit it to writing.

12022. Did you go to King-street, St. James's?—No.

12023. Did you go to Bury-street, St. James's?—No.

12024. Did you make any further inquiry about Mr. Gurney?—I went to Mr. Bozon.

12025. Except of Mr. Bozon, you made no further inquiry?—No, I did not.

12026. Did you ascertain in Bedford-place; you went to 17, Bedford-place?—Yes.

12027. Did you ascertain whether that had been, or was a boarding-house?—It appeared like a private house; a servant in livery opened the door.

12028. Did you ascertain whether it was or had been a boarding-house?—I did not. Mr. Green had been there, but Henry Collinson was not to be found there, nor at 17, Upper Bedford-place.

12029. You

Mr. *D. E. Stevens.*

1 May 1837.

12029. You know Poulton?—Yes; I know very little of him.

12030. When did you see him last?—I have not seen him for some days; not above once in the last fortnight.

12031. Have you been in habits of intimacy with him?—No, not at all; I knew nothing of him till last year.

12032. How did you become acquainted with him?—It was a connexion through Mr. Green with the South Cotton Company.

12033. Have you heard what has become of Mr. Poulton?—No, I have not.

12034. From nobody?—No.

12035. Have you heard from anybody what has become of him?—No.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Frederick Bozon*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *F. Bozon.*

12036. Mr. *Hill.*] ARE you a solicitor?—I am.

12037. Where do you reside?—Union-court, Old Broad-street.

12038. Do you know Mr. Richard Gurney?—Yes, I do. [*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*] I know the handwriting.

12039. Is that the handwriting of the Richard Gurney you know?—Yes.

12040. And are about to speak of?—Yes.

12041. Is he the brother of the banker at Norwich?—Not that I am aware of.

12042. Does he come from the west of England?—He comes from Tregony in Cornwall; I have known him about 23 or 24 years.

12043. Let me ask you what are his circumstances?—I do not know his exact circumstances, that is quite impossible.

12044. When did you see him last?—About 12 months ago.

12045. About this time last year did you meet him in Parliament-street?—Yes, somewhere thereabout.

12046. Where did he tell you he was living?—At Frankfort.

12047. Did he tell you why he was in England?—He told me he was living there, and that he was here upon a subpœna.

12048. I must have it out; did he tell you under what protection he was here?—I had a chat with him; I told him I heard there had been some writs against him, and I was astonished he was here. He said he defied the bums, that he always brought his protection with him in his pocket.

12049. What was that protection?—Some subpœna, or some order of arbitration.

12050. Have you been concerned for him, and against him?—Yes, some years ago.

12051. Should you like to trust him with 5*l.*?—It would depend upon circumstances, I cannot say about that.

12052. Under good security you would?—Yes; of course I should like to have good security.

12053. You have known him 20 years?—Yes, I have.

12054. Is he not a ruined man?—I do not know that, I cannot say that; it is impossible. I believe he married a woman of some fortune, but that is settled upon herself. I do not know that he is a ruined man; he is, in fact, a man of the world; he is a gambler.

12055. Is it safe to trust that man with 5*l.* on his own responsibility?—I cannot answer that question.

12056. You see he has signed this deed for 100 shares, for 5,000*l.*?—Yes, I see his name to it; I am not aware of what the deed imports.

12057. Do you think he is a responsible man for anything like that?—I should say not.

12058. Are you applied to now and then by sheriffs' officers to know where they can execute writs against Mr. Gurney?—I have been applied to by officers, and that was the reason of my speaking to him.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

12059. When was the last inquiry by any officer concerning Mr. Gurney?—I should think, 18 months ago.

Mr. *F. Bozon.*

1 May 1837.

12060. When have you ceased to act professionally for him, or to be at all acquainted with his means?—For the last six or seven years.

12061. Mr. Gurney has been a gentleman, originally, of large fortune?—Never.

12062. Was he ever a candidate for Tregony?—He canvassed for Tregony.

10063. He was never a man of large fortune?—No, he was a bankrupt, as a picture dealer, in 1822.

12064. That he may have been, though he may have been a man of large property; did not Mr. Gurney tell you, I do not know whether he did or not, when you met him in Parliament-street, that he was over here as a referee between a certain noble lord and Mr. Hamlet, with respect to a large sum of money?—No, he did not.

12065. Has he not been in London in the last month?—I have heard that he was.

12066. Do you not know the fact?—No, I do not; I have heard that he was.

12067. Be so good as to tell me whether that is his handwriting [*handing a letter to the Witness*]?—Yes, it is.

12068. Is that too in his handwriting [*handing another letter to the Witness*]?—Yes, that is his handwriting.

32069. Is Mr. Gurney, to your knowledge, a person in the habit of associating with people in high life?—I believe he is.

12070. He is the same gentleman who is supposed to have horsewhipped a certain deceased nobleman?—He is the same person.

12071. You have said he was a man of the world and a gambler; do you mean by that he has ever kept a gambling-house?—I have heard he has.

12072. Do you mean, when you say he is a man of the world and a gambler, that you know of his ever keeping a gambling-house?—I have heard he has, but I do not know it; I was never in the house.

12073. How long do you suppose he has resided at Frankfort?—I believe for two or three years.

12074. Occasionally coming here?—Yes.

12075. Is he a man who has been involved in considerable litigation?—He has been always in litigation, I have heard.

12076. I see by the letters, one of which is before you, that he alludes to an acquaintance with a gentleman whose name appears there?—I have not read it.

12077. Just read it.—" Sir, you will oblige me by letting me have 100 shares in the City Railway. I have the honour of an acquaintance with one of its directors, Major Macnamara, and feel well assured that any company to which his name is attached must be a respectable one. I am, Sir, your obedient servant, *Richard Gurney.*"

12078. Now the next.—" Sir, I feel obliged to the directors of the City Railway for so readily complying with my request for 100 shares, and to yourself for your speedy reply to my application; I shall glady take the full quantum, and be ready to pay the deposit money when required. In the course of to-morrow I hope to call at your office, and am, Sir, your very obedient servant, *Richard Gurney.* Paid Whitmore & Co., 13, Bury-street, St. James's, 10 April 1836. J. Binns, esquire."

Mr. *Clarkson* tendered to Mr. Hill the letter of appropriation and the bankers' book, to show the payment of the deposit by Mr. Gurney, the date of the letter of appropriation being the 13th of April 1836; and the payment appeared to be entered in the bankers' pass-books as follows: " Ditto, R. Garry, instead of Gurney, the 11th of April 1836."

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Laxton,* called in; and Re-examined:

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

12079. Mr. *Hill.*] I UNDERSTAND you have been speaking to deposits being paid by other persons than yourself; what means have you of knowing that fact?—From the inspection of the bankers' book; and also, if you refer to Mr. Blunt, he told me so.

12080. You have given the total number of deposits paid; how do you know that?—I stated from the bankers' book, through the secretary.

12081. The information came to you through the secretary?—Yes.

12082. What

12082. What was the regular mode of paying the deposits in your company?—At the commencement an application was made for so many shares; that application was investigated.

12083. I am speaking as to the deposits?—I am going to explain. Upon the application being examined and approved of, a letter of appropriation was sent to the parties, to state to them that so many shares had been allotted, and to request them to pay the deposit into Messrs. Whitmore & Company's, or Messrs. Ransom & Company's.

12084. That is the nature of the appropriation?—Yes.

12085. It was their duty to pay it into the bankers', and take the bankers' receipt?—Yes.

12086. Were all the deposits paid in that way?—At the commencement.

12087. How long did that continue the course of business?—I should think, for the first month; I should think so.

12088. Was there any alteration made after that time?—If any person made an application personally, that would be taken into consideration, and the number of shares would be allotted.

12089. In what way would that allotment be made?—If they thought the party was a respectable person, they would immediately allot him the number of shares.

12090. You say they; who do you mean?—The directors.

12091. They would order certain shares to be allotted?—Yes.

12092. What would be done next?—The party would pay the money into the bankers'.

12093. The directors would make an order that A. B. should have 100 shares; where would the secretary enter it?—On the minutes, I should think.

12094. How was it communicated to the person who made the application by a letter of appropriation?—I can scarcely answer whether it was so, or personally; there were not many personal applications.

12095. Suppose it was done so, what would the party be told to do?—To pay the money into the bankers'.

12096. The course of business is to pay the money into the bankers'?—Yes; some of the money was left in the hands of Mr. Beetham, and I have known it sometimes left in the hands of the secretary.

12097. It was not strictly the course of business to pay it into the bankers', and get a banker's receipt?—No, it was not; but the greater part was so done.

12098. If a person came to the office to sign the deed, what was it the duty of the attesting witness to do?—The party would produce the bankers' receipt; having paid so much into the bankers', he was allowed to sign his name to the deed.

12099. Upon the production of the bankers' receipt?—Yes.

12100. Or if the money was paid into the hands of the secretary, that was considered tantamount to a bankers' receipt?—Yes.

12101. But money or a receipt it was the duty of the party to have?—Yes, at that time.

12102. What time?—In the first month after the shares were allotted.

12103. I want to know when that wholesome practice was changed?—It went on so; I should say, generally speaking, the money was paid into the bankers' first.

12104. I am not asking you as to that; I am asking you when the course of business to have either a receipt or the money produced at the time of executing the deed, to the attesting witness to the deed, was departed from?—That is a question I cannot answer; because, after the first week the deed was removed from the company's offices to Mr. Beetham's offices, it was not thought worth while for any clerk to remain.

12105. Do you mean that after the first week the secretary attended at Mr. Beetham's offices?—No; the deed was generally witnessed by Mr. Beetham's clerk or some person nominated by him.

12106. Who was he?—I think—

12107. Do I understand you to say after the first week there are but few attestations of the secretary?—Will you allow me to have one of the printed copies before me, then I can speak to the fact.

12108. Were you cognizant of what was done at the railway office; were you in attendance yourself?—Not always; I was there very frequently.

12109. In that part of the office where the signatures would take place?—In the office; I did not stop there long.

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

1 May 1837.

12110. You have spoken pretty much to the practice of these things; did you attend meetings of the board of direction?—Very frequently I did.

12111. That took place upon the general business?—I did not take part in it, except receiving instructions and so on. I took part in the commencement in allotting the shares; but I know nothing further, otherwise than from the instructions I have received as to my professional business.

12112. Do I understand you to say that your interference, subsequently to the allotting of the shares, was strictly confined to your profession as a surveyor and engineer?—Yes; I do not know whether the traffic might be so considered; I took a great interest in getting parties to take the traffic properly.

12113. You superintended the traffic?—I engaged parties to superintend it.

12114. Did you engage parties to make inquiry, each in his own distinct department?—There are two principal parties; I recommended to the directors to employ others.

12115. Who are the principals?—Mr. Atterbury is one.

12116. His christian name?—I do not recollect it.

12117. Who was the other?—Brown.

12118. When did they come into the concern?—Mr. Atterbury was engaged, I think, about last August or October, I think, or September; about that time.

12119. And Mr. Brown?—He was engaged, I think, about last November.

12120. Did you engage them?—I did Atterbury, but not Brown.

12121. Do you yourself know him?—Yes, I do.

12122. I think it appears that the number of applicants who were not allowed shares was 165?—Yes, it was.

12123. You told me on Saturday that you had employed eight persons to make examinations about the applicants for shares, and that you would bring their names to me?—Yes, I will mention them; Mr. Gethen.

12124. The secretary?—He was not secretary at the time; Mr. Woolcot, sen. and Mr. Woolcot, jun., Mr. Capel, Mr. Binns, jun., Mr. Hill, and there was another person.

12125. I must ask you the christian name of that gentleman, Mr. Hill?—I cannot tell that, and another person, whose name I do not recollect.

12126. Did you engage those gentlemen?—I think I introduced two of them.

12127. *Chairman.*] Whom did you introduce?—The two Woolcots and Mr. Hill I introduced.

12128. Mr. *Hill.*] Who else?—Those are all the parties I introduced.

12129. Any one else?—No one, that I remember.

12130. Do you recollect who the others were introduced by?—Mr. Gethen was introduced by one of the directors, and Mr. Capel was introduced by one of the directors.

12131. You said they were employed a long time?—They were for a fortnight engaged.

12132. Lord Lake was a director in compliance with an application of his own?—Yes, he was.

Mr. *Hill* applied for the letter of application, the letter of appropriation and the bankers' receipt, with respect to Mr. Verbeke's shares.

Mr. *Beetham* stated that they could not be produced, for they were not in existence, but he undertook to search for such documents as there were.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the production of the documents alluded to, unless some ground was previously laid to entitle Mr. Hill to call for them, and unless the explanation of Mr. Beetham was taken at the same time.

Mr. *Beetham* proceeded to search for the documents now in question, and produced the counterparts of the scrip for the shares. The following is a copy of one of them:

"City Railway, No. 532, April 1836, Mr. Charles Theodore Verbeke, 20*l.* W. G."

Similar vouchers were produced, running from 532 to 556, inclusive.

12133. Do you understand these documents?—Yes.

12134. When were they made out?—I am sure I do not know when they were made out; I cannot tell that.

12135. I see they are made out in various forms; but dated April 1836?—I believe some hundreds of them were all filled in April 1836, at the time of the appropriation; the certificates were filled up April 1836, just as you see it there.

12136. Who

12136. Who put in the day of the month?—The day of the month was filled in at the time the shares were given, generally.

12137. Whose handwriting is this (*showing one of the vouchers to the Witness*)?—It is, I think, Mr. Beetham's; some of them.

12138. Whose is the handwriting, "W. G."?—The secretary, Mr. Gethen.

12139. Is the body of it all Mr. Beetham's?—No; I think it is the secretary's; they have all been checked by the secretary.

12140. Is the number, and the word "April," in the same handwriting as the other part of the paper?—No, it is not.

12141. Whose is the word "April"?—I do not know the handwriting.

12142. Whose is "Charles Theodore Verebeke"?—I think that is Mr. Beetham's writing.

12143. Then, if I understand you, what was done when the appropriaton was made, was writing "five hundred and thirty-two, April"?—Yes.

12144. Leaving the name to be filled in at an after time?—Yes.

12145. When the name was filled in, you cannot tell?—I should think December or January last; but Mr. Beetham can speak to it better than I can.

12146. What makes you think it was in December or January?—Because there was a negotiation going on with him about some compensation for some property abutting upon the lands over which the railway passed.

12147. They began in December?—Yes.

12148. It went through January; when did it come to a close?—I think in January.

12149. Are there any documents in the office to show that?—There is the agreement.

Mr. *Hill* called for the production of the agreement between the company and Mr. Verebeke.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the production of the document.

The *Chairman* suggested whether the passage in the deed relating to this matter might not be read without going into the whole of the contents of the deed.

Mr. *Hill* suggested that the agreement should be put into the hands of the Chairman, in order that he might exercise his judgment upon it, whether it ought to be given in evidence.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated that the Committee could not forget who the parties were making the inquiry, and that the privilege ought to be most carefully narrowed; that if the other parties would call the gentlemen capable of explaining the document, he had no objection to its being produced.

Mr. *Hill* was heard in answer to the objection; and stated that Mr. Clarkson might call any person he pleased, now, to explain the document in question.

Mr. *Clarkson* was heard in reply.

The Committee-room was cleared.

After some time, the counsel and parties were again called in, and informed that the Committee had decided "That a certain agreement referred to in the Minutes be produced for the inspection of the Committee previously to deciding whether it shall form the subject of examination."

The agreement was handed to the Committee.

The counsel and parties were again directed to withdraw.

After some time, they were again called in and informed that the Committee had decided that so much of the said agreement and documents as relates to the deposit of shares be read over to the parties and form the subject of examination.

Mr. *Clarkson* inquired whether the documents were to be considered as produced without the examination of Mr. Beetham, who was the party to produce them, and which was the only point he had raised for the consideration of the Committee.

The *Chairman* inquired whether Mr. Clarkson meant that the examination of Mr. Beetham was to be confined to matters relating to this agreement only, or to go into a general examination as to other matters.

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

1 May 1837.

Mr. *Clarkson* replied, not unless Mr. Hill went into any further examination of Mr. Beetham.

The *Chairman* stated, that if any explanation was required, in all probability the Committee would call for and examine some of the officers of the company; that the better way would be to consider the documents as called for by the Committee, and Mr. Hill would then proceed to examine any officer of the company he thought proper.

Mr. *D. E. Stevens*, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. *D. E. Stevens.*

12150. *Chairman.*] IS there any correction in your evidence you wish to give?—Yes.

12151. In your evidence of this morning?—Yes.

12152. State it?—Upon inquiry at 4, Taunton-place, I got no information about Mr. Langley; but a female at 54, George-street, whom I took to be the servant, referred us to the Poultry; but previously I had got the information about 54, George-street, from the person who removed the goods, living opposite the Middlesex Hospital.

[The Witness withdrew.

Martis, 2° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. Warburton.
Mr. Forster.	

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

[*The following Document was delivered in, together with its Enclosures.*]

Dear Sir, 11, Parliament-street, 29 March 1837.

Enclosed are the thirty shares; I have paid the deposit into the bankers' in your name.

I am yours, truly,

To Mr. Holland, Duke-street, Adelphi. *W. Laxton.*

Certificate for ten shares, No. 7, 115, dated London, 15th March 1837, signed by three members of the committee, Richard Cooke, R. H. Graham, and J. H. Walker; W. Gethen, assistant-secretary.

Certificate for ten shares, No. 716, same date, and signed by the same parties.

Certificate for ten shares, No. 717, the same date, and signed by the same parties.

[*The following Letter was delivered in.*]

Dear Sir, 11, Parliament-street, 3 March 1837.

I have written to Mr. Martin, for him to call here this afternoon or evening, when I will settle some plan to relieve you from your fears.

Yours, truly,

To Mr. Holland, Duke-street, Adelphi. *W. Laxton.*

Mr. *William Laxton*, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. *W. Laxton.*

2 May 1837.

The Committee resolved that they would not go into the inquiry respecting the agreement between the directors and Mr. Verbeke; and the Chairman stated that they would strike out of their Minutes all that related to that agreement.

Mr. *Hill* inquired, whether he was not to inquire into the *bonâ fide* character of the subscription by Mr. Verbeke.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to Mr. Hill being heard.

The *Chairman* stated, that the Committee entertained no doubt that, if the Act passed, Mr. Verbeke would be a *bonâ fide* holder of the shares; the transaction by which he would become so, the subscribers, if they thought proper, might question; and in that view of the subject, the Committee considered it better not to inquire into the transaction.

12153-8. Mr. *Hill.*] DID I understand you to say, that the Southampton Railway Company were the only opponents of this line?—I said, the principal opponents; all the others were for compensation.

12159. Do

12159. Do you know that Mr. Stephen Moore is an opponent, and Mr. Burnett?—We are negotiating with him.

12160. He is an opponent?— Yes.

12161. And the Battersea-Bridge Company; do you not know that they are opponents?—I am not quite confident of that.

12162. Do they not oppose you?—Yes; but I do not consider them anything.

12163. Did you mean to say that the Southampton Company were your only opponents in this Committee?—Yes, in this Committee.

12164. Do you happen to know who gave Captain Polhill information that Mr. Lill was drunk at the time he signed the petition?—I do not.

12165. You are aware he stated that?—To the best of my recollection he stated that, from the information he had received, he believed he was drunk.

12166. In a public place, before a highly important body of men, do you happen to know that Captain Polhill asserted ——

12167. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Were you present?—No, I was not.

12168. Mr. *Hill.*] That he had heard that Lill was drunk?—I cannot speak to what passed.

12169. Have you heard from Captain Polhill that he did make that statement?—No, I have not.

12170. Have you seen Lill upon the subject of this petition?—I have not.

12171. Do you know any one connected with this company who has?—I think Mr. Macnamara has seen him, a gentleman by the side of you.

12172. What is Mr. Macnamara?—A gentleman connected with the company.

12173. Is he the solicitor of the company?—He is a relative of Mr. Beetham.

12174. Do you know who drew up Mr. Lill's second petition?—It was drawn up in conjunction with the solicitor.

12175. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Did you see it drawn up?—No, I did not. It was drawn up conjointly by Mr. Macnamara and Mr. Lill's solicitor.

12176. Mr. Lill's solicitor?—Yes; Mr. Rogers.

12177. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Whether Mr. Lill was drunk or not would be probably better known by Mr. Lill or Mr. Bircham?—I should think so.

12178. Mr. Lill's second petition was prepared by the joint assistance of Mr. Macnamara and Mr. Lill's own attorney?—It was.

12179. Did you learn that Mr. Rogers had been the attorney for Mr. Lill some time before that?—I did not; he stated he was his attorney.

12180. You spoke of Mr. Burnett, Mr. Stephen Moore, and the Battersea Bridge Company; when you speak of their being opponents to the measure, do you mean persons who contemplate the opposing of the measure in the Committee on the Bill, or that they are petitioners, or represented by any body in this Committee?—I never understood that they were represented in this Committee or had presented any petition.

12181. Is there anybody, to your knowledge, opposing this measure in this Commitee but the Southampton Company?—Not to my knowledge.

[The Witness withdrew.

The *Chairman* inquired whether Mr. Clarkson was now ready to cross-examine Mr. Green.

Mr. *Clarkson* suggested to the Committee that it would be convenient for him to see the course that Mr. Hill took with respect to the remainder of the case, inasmuch as he might not, and probably should not, cross-examine Mr. Green.

The *Chairman* stated that the regular time to cross-examine Mr. Green was, when the original examination ceased, and it was out of indulgence to Mr. Clarkson that the cross-examination did not immediately proceed, and that Mr. Hill could not be called upon to go on with his case until Mr Clarkson had determined whether he would cross-examine Mr. Green.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated that Green had made a deposition affecting the reputation and property of a vast number of persons, and that he was not now prepared to deal with the individual cases spoken to by Green.

Mr. *Hill* was heard in reply to the observations of Mr. Clarkson.

The *Chairman* stated that after the time that had been allowed, Mr. Clarkson might be fairly called upon to proceed with Mr. Green's cross-examination.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, from his own knowledge, that it had not been possible to make the inquiries necessary, and he should therefore take upon himself

himself the responsibility not to cross-examine Mr. Green at all, reserving to himself the right to examine any witnesses to contradict him, that might hereafter appear to be necessary.

Mr. *Francis Beetham*, called in; and Examined.

Mr *F. Beetham.*

2 May 1837.

Mr. *Hill* stated he should propose to examine Mr. Beetham before he examined Mr. Bircham.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to Mr. Bircham remaining in the room while Mr. Beetham was under examination, Mr. Bircham being a petitioner.

Mr. *Hill* declined to examine Mr. Beetham without the assistance of Mr. Bircham to advise him.

Mr. *Francis Thomas Bircham*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *F. T. Bircham.*

12182. YOU have put a petition upon this table?—I have.

12183. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You are a petitioner?—Yes, I am.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that he understood there was a rule of the House that a petitioner could not be examined.

The *Chairman* stated he was not aware of any such rule.

12184. Mr. *Hill.*] Are the contents of this petition, as far as you speak in this petition from your own knowledge, true?—Yes.

12185. And as far as you speak to your belief, do you still believe in what you have stated as matter of belief?—Yes.

Mr. *Hill* stated, that that was all he intended to ask Mr. Bircham.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated he had nothing to ask Mr. Bircham.

12186. Mr. *Hill*, to Mr. *Bircham.*] You wish to make some exception to what you have stated?—There is an allegation at the end of Mr. Lill's petition, of which I state my belief.

12187. Read the allegation carefully; what is it?—"That amongst the subscribers to the said undertaking, appear the names of many needy persons, who, as your petitioner has been informed and believes, are totally and notoriously unable to meet their liabilities under the said subscription deed, and some of whom, at least, were induced to subscribe their names thereto as the creatures of others, who being unwilling to incur the responsibility of executing the deed themselves, procured such needy individuals to do so, on consideration of a small commission."

12188. Which is the part you make the exception to?—I believe still that that allegation is true, with this exception; it is true to this extent, that though persons have signed the deed for others, and I was told in three or four instances the sum agreed to have been paid for signing it, I never intended to assert, and I do not impute it, that they were paid by the company or persons connected with the company; but that they were paid as little jobbers by persons standing behind them who paid the deposits. I could state persons who signed for others, but I do not know that a commission was paid by others, though I was told so at the time.

12189. Is that the exception?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

12190. Now tell the Committee the name of the person who told you so?—One John Jackson; I met him. Do you mean as to the small commission?

12191. Yes.—I was told by Mr. Robson, of the Stock Exchange, pointing to a name.

12192. What name?—Richard Blackman. He said, "I have no doubt of that man; I think he signed those shares for me; it is his common habit to do it."

12193. When was this?—This must have been early in March, I should say, or before Mr. Lill's first petition was presented.

12194. Were you the person who prepared Mr. Lill's first petition?—I was.

12195. By whose direction?—I was directed by four or five gentlemen who were appointed a sub-committee at a meeting, as I have mentioned in my own petition, to prepare a petition to be signed, to bring this matter before the House.

12196. Name the four or five gentlemen?—Mr. Cobb, of Banbury, was one; Mr. Stunt was another of the sub-committee; Mr. Reid, the secretary of the Southampton Railway, was another; and I do not know whom he represented, but Mr. Bailey, of the firm of Smith, Bailey, and Jackson, was another, representing some party.

12197. What sub-committee was this?—I do not know that it is a sub-committee;

mittee; I should call it a committee that was appointed at the meeting mentioned in my first petition, held at the King's Arms, on the 13th March.

12198. Who called that meeting?—That meeting was called by a circular issued by me.

12199. In what capacity?—On the instruction of Mr. Cobb.

12200. Who is Mr. Cobb?—He is the son of a land-owner on the line, and his father is a large proprietor in the Battersea Bridge.

12201. Is he a petitioner against the Bill?—Except as a Battersea Bridge proprietor, I believe not; I do not know it.

12202. Who else instructed you, besides Mr. Cobb, to call that meeting at the King's Arms?—I was not instructed by any other party; but these were the circumstances: Mr. Cobb came to me, expecting I would do something against this measure, knowing that the Southampton Company were its opponents, and that I was employed by them; I told him I was not instructed to take any steps at that time; that their opposition was limited to what was stated in the petition then already prepared or presented, I do not know which; and I told Mr. Few, whom Mr. Cobb also saw upon the subject, I declined to go to the expense of printing the summonses, unless Mr. Cobb would say he authorized me to do so.

12203. Had you the instructions or directions of any persons, except persons connected with, or members of the Southampton Railway undertaking, for anything you did as to the matter before this Committee?—None, certainly, before this Committee.

12204. Who introduced Mr. Lill to you?—He introduced himself to me; I got Mr. Lill's name, with a vast number of others, who were dissentients upon the list deposited at the Private Bill Office; when I wanted to summon this meeting, I understood a great many persons dissented, and the only way I knew of getting at their names was to go to the Private Bill Office, and I got a list there, and directed notice to be sent to them.

12205. Was that with a view of opposing it in the Committee upon the Bill, or to take measures upon the subscription list?—I can say, at that time the subscription list was not thought of; I got that list to oppose the Bill. I can state when the subscription list came up, it was on the publication of the petition against the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway.

12206. Will you undertake to say that Mr. Lill was a petitioner against the Bill?—No, except from the petition; I was told he signed a petition against it.

12207. Have you seen his name to any petition?—No, I have not.

12208. Have you any instructions from Mr. Lill to appear before this Committee on his behalf?—None other than are implied in the prayer of Mr. Lill's petitions, which he had read over to him, that he might be heard by counsel, and he was told that the petition would be proceeded in, but without any expense to him.

12209. Have you any instructions from Mr. Lill to represent him in this Committee?—Certainly not.

12210. Have you any instructions from the Southampton Railway to represent Mr. Lill in this Committee?—No; they presented a petition.

12211. Did Mr. Lill, or did the Southampton Company, instruct you to represent Mr. Lill in this Committee?—I was instructed by the Southampton Railway Company to appear, certainly not specifically on Mr. Lill's petition, but I had general instructions from them; whether to appear on Mr. Lill's petition, I do not know that any of the directors knew of Mr. Lill's petition; there was no proceeding then before this Committee, certainly.

12212. Did you receive instruction from Mr. Lill upon his petition, or did the company you represent authorize you to represent Mr. Lill in this Committee?—Certainly; if Mr. Lill's petition had continued, I should have represented him here.

12213. Have you received any instructions to do so?—Certainly not, because I do not know that any of the company knew of Mr. Lill's petition till it was withdrawn.

12214. Who procured the presentation of Mr. Lill's petition?—I may be said to do so.

12215. Did you do so?—Yes, I did.

12216. After Mr. Lill's petition had been referred to this honourable Committee, have you had, either from Mr. Lill or the Southampton Company, any instructions to represent Mr. Lill in this committee?—I had no instructions from Mr. Lill other than those implied, and, I have mentioned before, I had no instructions from the

Mr. *F. T. Bircham.*

2 May 1837.

the Southampton Company to appear on Mr. Lill's petition, because they did not know of the existence of the petition.

12217. Then in what capacity did you procure that petition?—Certainly as solicitor of the Southampton Company. I have so acted upon it, and I look to them to pay me.

12218. In what capacity did you obtain it?—Upon the instruction of those four or five gentlemen in the first instance.

12219. The private instructions of those four or five gentlemen?—Yes.

12220. Among those four or five persons you named the secretary of your own company?—Yes, and I considered when I went to our board to tell them such a petition had been presented, that they would jointly with others have adopted it; and that was the principle I proceeded upon.

12221. Have they ever adopted it?—Only by their petition, taking up the allegations.

12222. How many persons attended this meeting?—I should say thirty or forty.

12223. Will you undertake to say there were twenty?—Yes, I should say so; but I did not count them.

12224. Will you undertake to say positively there were more than fifteen?—Yes, certainly.

12225. Were there any persons there not connected with the Southampton Railway?—Yes.

12226. Who?—Mr. Lane attended on behalf of Mr. Moore? Mr. Bailey attended on behalf of the Battersea Bridge and certain other people, and Mr. Chisholme.

12227. For whom did he attend?—The Vauxhall Bridge, I think.

12228. Any body else?—Yes; I believe many other persons, but I do not recollect them at the present time. There was Mr. Beaufoy, of the vinegar works, and some one from Messrs. Burnett, and Mr. Stunt attended with his solicitor.

12229. Who is Mr. Stunt?—A bootmaker in the Strand, a petitioner against the bill; and Mr. Lill attended of course.

12230. Did the committee or Mr. Lill at any time instruct you to give instructions to my learned friend Mr. Hill on Mr. Lill's behalf?—No.

12231. Did you instruct my learned friend Mr. Hill to appear for Mr. Lill?—I did.

12232. By whose authority?—I did it on the presumption, certainly, that I should have the sanction of the Southampton Company.

12233. Had you any authority when you did it?—No, I had not any specific authority; but I beg to explain this: at that time it became obvious that an expense would be incurred in this matter; I spoke to Bailey, one of the members of that committee, and who was a member, or represented a person that was a member of the Battersea Bridge direction, as to the expenses likely to be incurred in the support of this petition, and then Mr. Bailey said, "You must look to the Southampton Railway for them, for almost every one of the committee are opposing on their own grounds; you are not opposing in that way yet, and you must take up the petition." I proceeded upon the assumption, that if the other three or four fell away from me, the Southampton Company would support me; but before the company knew of Mr. Lill's petition being presented, a second petition was presented, withdrawing it.

12234. Did the Southampton Company know you had instructed anybody to appear for Mr. Lill, or know of the existence of a petition by Mr. Lill, till that petition had been withdrawn?—Except Mr. Reid the secretary, I do not think any one did.

12235. Did you take upon yourself, without instructions, nay, without the knowledge of your employers, to instruct my learned friend to represent Mr. Lill, who had never given you any authority at all.

Mr. *Hill* objected to the question.

12236. Before Mr. Lill's petition was withdrawn, do you remember the Honourable Committee asking my learned friend for whom he appeared?—Yes.

12237. And, instructed by you, he stated he appeared for Mr. Lill?—Yes.

12238. After that, did you go out into the corridor, or whatever it is called?—Yes.

12239. Did you then see Mr. Lill?—Yes.

12240. Did Mr. Lill protest against your proceeding for him?—Mr. Lill said he had become frightened about the petition, and thought he should withdraw it.

12241. Did

12241. Did he protest against your proceeding for him?—No; I did not understand it so.

12242. State, to the best of your recollection, what Mr. Lill told you?—I think I have stated the effect of it; he said he was freightned about it, or his solicitor who stood by him said it, and that he might be made liable to pay the costs of that inquiry, if the House thought it frivolous, or that he might have actions brought against him for libel; there was a vast deal of conversation, but the arrangement was, if I would give him a guarantee to hold him harmless against those two points, he did not mind it being proceeded with.

12243. What did you do?—I declined that.

12244. Did he not withdraw any appearance by you as his solicitor?—I did not understand it so.

12245. Did he do so?—He did not.

12246. You state that positively?—He said to Mr. Rogers he would leave the thing entirely in his hands, and Mr. Rogers gave me authority for the present to proceed in the petition.

12247. You state that positively?—Yes, I certainly understood I was to see Mr. Rogers upon the subject, and probably he would require that undertaking he had mentioned on Mr. Lill's behalf before.

12248. Did Mr. Rogers ever authorize you to proceed either for that time or at all upon Mr. Lill's petition, without an indemnity being given?—Clearly so; for that morning I understood him to say, and I am strengthened in that position, because the learned gentleman Mr. Hill was by at the time, and I understood from him he did not choose to go into the committee-room again till Mr. Lill assented to his doing so.

12249. Who drew the petition of the company?—I did.

12250. Did the Southampton Company petition at your instance?—No.

12251. It was a voluntary act of their own?—When I say not at my instance, I represented the facts that had taken place to them, and certainly, without being urged by me to do it, they discussed the matter, and came to a resolution to do it.

12252. How long was it after Mr. Lill had applied to withdraw his petition that they resolved to present that petition?—The Easter holidays immediately came upon the withdrawal of Mr. Lill's petition.

12253. How long was it afterwards?—Except that I had a general conversation previously with some of the directors individually, who said that they individually felt that a petition ought to be presented, taking up the matter, but the board of directors did not agree to put the common seal to it till a day or two before it was presented, which was after the holidays.

12254. How long was it after Mr. Lill's petition was withdrawn?—

It appeared that the second petition of Mr. Lill was presented the 21st of March, and that the petition of the Southampton Company was presented the 4th of April.

Witness.] As soon as the fact was known that Mr. Lill had withdrawn his petition, I had a very early understanding with most of the directors individually, stating that a petition would be presented, taking it up; but the board was not held till the Friday before the petition was presented, which was ten days after Mr. Lill withdrew it.

12255. Before you had any instructions from the Southampton Company, had you sent scouts round, or persons employed by you, to endeavour to ascertain the character of persons subscribers to this deed?—I had gone to several parties myself; yes, I had.

12256. Had you employed Mr. Green?—I had not to make inquiries, but I had got many facts from him.

12257. Had you sent persons round to make inquiries before that time?—No; I do not think I had.

12258. Will you undertake to say you had not?—I think not.

12259. And more than one?—I forget when it was that Green and Poulton originally gave me information upon the matter, or when they commenced making inquiries; they certainly gave me information before the petition was presented.

12260. I am asking you how long had you been employing persons to make inquiries into the characters of others without instructions from any one?—I perfectly recollect that Mr. Green and Mr. Poulton were first instructed, not by me, but by Mr. Stunt, and were making inquiries before I employed them.

Mr. *F. T. Bircham.*

2 May 1837.

12261. I ask you whether you will venture to state to this Committee that you had not yourself employed persons to investigate the character of others, subscribers to this deed, without authority from anybody?—Certainly, before I had a direct authority for the adoption of that petition by the Southampton Railway Company.

12262. Before any authority from anybody?—If by authority is meant, before any direct authority, I say certainly.

12263. Had you not in fact employed persons to investigate the characters of the subscribers to this deed, before your own company knew that the petition of Mr. Lill was presented?—I cannot recollect when it was that Mr. Green went round first on my instructions.

12264. Had you the instructions of any individual, either in a public or private capacity, to take any steps to investigate the characters of those men before you yourself had employed persons to do so?—I had the instruction of that committee to investigate the subscription list; general instructions certainly. The committee appointed at the first meeting sat after the meeting itself had dispersed. The petition of Poulton and Green as to the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway had been produced at that meeting, and so far discussed, that it appeared that several names that were on that petition, alleged to be insolvent persons, were on the City Railway subscription deed. Mr. Stunt undertook to go to Mr. Green and Poulton, and ask them what evidence they could give in support of it; and I was asked to go to the Stock Exchange, and inquire of persons likely to give information upon the subject, whether there were any such names on this list. That committee met the Tuesday in the following week, and I told them the result of my inquiries, and they said, by all means a petition should be prepared. Until that day I had not seen Mr. Green and Mr. Poulton; they were brought there by Mr. Stunt: whether they had been employed by him previously in making inquiries, I do not know. I did not employ them for some time to come. I saw them continually, and had information from them; as far as my recollection serves me, it must have been some time after that I employed Green to go round and make inquiries.

12265. Will you undertake to say you had not employed Mr. Green before that meeting was held?—Most certainly; I had not seen him.

12266. Who was in the chair?—Sir John Scott Lillie.

12267. Had he left before you had instructions from some of those that remained?—Yes.

12268. Tell me the names of those you had instructions from?—The five or six that remained were Mr. Stunt, Mr. Bailey——

12269. Who is Mr. Stunt?—A petitioner against the Bill, and a bootmaker in the Strand.

12270. Who was Mr. Bailey?—A petitioner for the Battersea Bridge Company; then Mr.——

12271. Who was he?—One of the Battersea Bridge Company; a son of a landowner upon the line; Mr. Reed was present, the secretary of the Southampton Company, and Mr. Lane of Goldsmiths' Hall.

12272. Do you mean that those five persons employed you to make inquiries into the character of the subscribers to this deed?—They requested me to do so; I do not say that they retained me, so that I could recover my expenses against them; but we were all anxious to oppose the measure, and they requested me to take up this part of it.

12273. Why were you anxious to oppose the measure?—For the Southampton Company.

12274. Is there any other reason?—No.

12275. Why were the others anxious?—I do not know; Mr. Cobb was the son of a landowner on the line, and a large Battersea Bridge proprietor.

12276. You say you do not know why they were anxious; why was the Southampton Company so anxious?—Up to this very day on which I attended this meeting, Messrs. Few, the joint solicitors of the Southampton Railway, had attended exclusively to the negotiation between the two companies; and I have been told in this room, that the reason of our company's opposition is, because they could not make the terms they wished; and I heard those terms, for the first time with any distinctness, last Saturday.

12277. You not being the person conducting this part of the affairs of the company?—Certainly. I had prepared the petition that was to be presented,

confined to one subject, which was, that of crossing the terminus of the Southampton Railway in a manner disadvantageous to our company's interest, and upon that I prepared a petition; but as to the general communication, which led to the breaking off the negotiation, I had nothing to do with it.

12278. That petition would have been referred to another committee?—Yes.

12279. Amongst the 30 or 40 who attended the committee or sub-committee, were Mr. Poulton and Mr. Green two?—Certainly not; it was at that meeting that Mr. Stunt undertook to seek out Poulton and Green, to learn whether the statement, as to the Deptford and Westminster Bridge, which impugned the same names on this list, were true.

12280. You have mentioned the name of one person from whom you learnt, at the Stock Exchange, that he had no doubt that A, pointing to a name there, was one that had paid for or got shares for another, and very likely for him; can you mention the name of another person?—Yes; I was told that Mr. Martin was sure to have done so.

12281. Who told you so?—I believe Green, or one of those parties, giving him at the same time a description of the man and his means.

12282. Anybody else?—Mr. Bloxam was mentioned.

12283. By anybody else but Green?—No.

12284. Can you mention any person of respectability of your acquaintance who led you to believe that that paragraph of Lill's petition was true?—No persons of my own acquaintance are acquainted with those persons on the Stock Exchange. I was forced to go to persons that were acquainted with them, and by them I was told these facts.

12285. Can you name anybody else that you say confirmed the facts, so as to warrant you in stating you believed that statement to be true?—Yes; very soon after that meeting, I saw John Edward Stokes, who pointed out several names in the list, I cannot say specifically which, at present, who could not pay the deposit from their own means, but whose business it regularly was to sign for other persons and receive a small commission for doing it.

12286. Did the information you obtained, speak of the fact as a probable one, or was it speaking of a fact within his own knowledge?—Certainly not within his own knowledge, but of the highest degree of probability, and within his own knowledge these persons could not have raised the deposit.

12287. They were dealers in shares?—Yes.

12288. Was there any one living person who stated to you, of his own knowledge, that any one person signing that deed had received money?—Not of his own knowledge.

12289. Who drew up the allegations of Lill's petition?—I did.

12290. From any instruction of his?—No.

12291. You drew up his petition without any instructions from him?—Yes.

Re-examined by Mr. *Hill.*

12292. When was it that the public attention and your attention were first directed to the subscription lists?—It was on the printing, with the Votes, of Poulton's petition, which I think is about the 9th of March.

12293. Did the meeting of which you have spoken pretty soon follow that exposure?—Yes, it did; it was on the 13th, and the petition was presented on the 9th, and printed the morning of the 10th.

12294. Did the meeting of which you have spoken soon follow upon the 10th?—I am pretty certain that the meeting was on the 13th; it was on a Saturday.

12295. Mr. Lill was present at that meeting?—Yes.

12296. Did he take an active part in it?—He spoke against the railway very strongly as to the prejudice it would be to him.

12297. He did take a very active part?—Yes; he came to me, seeing me taking down the names of the parties in the room, and seeing me actively engaged, he said he was ready to subscribe, or do anything he could to oppose the measure; that it would be the ruin of him, and take his house from under him, and he would pay money, or do anything he could to oppose the measure; and he certainly did say something in his speech with respect to the subscription list, that he had been nearly ruined before by the family of the Bloxams, and his name was on this subscription list.

12298. He showed himself an ardent opponent?—Yes, to the strongest possible extent; he offered to subscribe money, which I consider a test.

Mr. *F. T. Bircham.*

2 May 1837.

12299. After you had made your inquiries and prepared the petition, did you send that petition to Mr. Lill by Mr. Francis, your clerk?—Yes, I did.

12300. What instructions did you give to Mr. Francis?—I instructed him to lay the petition before Mr. Lill, that he might state that investigations had been made which led me, who had prepared the petition, to believe it; that if he liked to sign it, well and good, but no pursuasion whatever should be used to induce him to sign it.

12301. From your knowledge of that young gentleman, Mr. Francis, is he a person on whom you can rely, to carry your instructions into effect?—I can.

12302. Was the petition prepared and engrossed, using the word "petitioner" in the singular number?—Yes; my instruction was this: it was prepared and engrossed, using the word "petitioner" in the singular number, having a strong belief that Mr. Lill, on having it laid before him, would sign it; but, if he found, on communicating with Mr. Lill, that other persons would sign it, he was at liberty, or it would be well he should get it so signed; but it was, in fact, prepared as the petition of an individual, and must be altered to have it signed by more than one person.

12303. Now I will come to the time when this petition was presented; it was presented to the House on what day?—It was on the 16th of March.

12304. Was there a notice of motion given at that time by the Honourable Member who presented it, to refer this petition to this Committee?—Yes, the following night.

10305. Let me call your attention to the prayer of Mr. Lill's petition: "Your petitioner therefore humbly prays your Honourable House that the said Bill may not be allowed to pass into a law as it now stands, and that the matters aforesaid may be referred to a Select Committee, to be appointed with all proper powers for the investigation thereof, or that the Committee to whom the said Bill stands referred may be instructed without delay to investigate the same as a preliminary inquiry, and with a view to save your petitioner and the other parties the expense of previously appearing before the said Committee on other grounds of opposition to the said Bill, and that your petitioner may be heard by himself, his counsel, agents, and witnesses, upon the matters aforesaid." Do you happen to know the reason why the motion was made to refer the petition to this Committee, instead of referring it to the Committee on the Bill?

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the question.

Mr. *Hill* was heard in support of the question.

The *Chairman* stated, that the witness might be asked what his motives were, but not what the motives of other persons were.

Mr. *Hill* stated, he would ask by whose advice it was done?

Mr. *F. T. Bircham*, called in; and further Examined.

12306. *Committee.*] BY whose advice was it you took the course of referring this matter to the Select Committee, instead of the Committee on the Bill?—Mr. Pryme's.

12307. Mr. *Hill.*] This petition was presented, as it appears, on the 17th of March, and was printed. How long was it before you heard any objection made on the part of Mr. Lill?—I heard none made until the interview on the stairs of the committee room.

12308. What was the date of that interview?—His petition withdrawing his first petition will show it; that was the day before; if the petition was the 21st, it was the 20th.

12309. Was the subject debating in the House of Commons at the time the reference was made?—I understood it to be so.

12310. Was the Committee upon the Bill assembled at the time you first heard that Mr. Lill had any objection to his petition?—It was.

12311. Do you remember your counsel happening to pass upon the staircase at the time you first heard of this?—Yes, I do.

12312. Did you bring Mr. Rogers to him?—Yes, I did.

12313. After some discussion, did Mr. Rogers request your counsel to go into the room?—I distinctly understood it so; I would certainly state he did not object to it, most certainly.

12314. Had your counsel refused to go back into the room until the point was settled?—Yes.

12315. Did

Mr. *F. T. Bircham.*

2 May 1837.

12315. Did you hear several messages delivered to your counsel from the Chairman of the Committee, requesting him to come into the room?—I did; there were divers messengers came from the committee room, saying, the Committee were waiting for us; who they proceeded from I do not know.

12316. Did your counsel and yourself still refuse to go back into the room until the point was settled?—In point of fact we did not go back into the room until the point was settled: it was the feeling on my mind not to go back till the point was settled; and, from everything that fell from the counsel, I have no doubt it was his feeling, and in point of fact we did wait till the thing was settled.

12317. Did Mr. Rogers several times declare to you that there was no imputation that any improper motives had been held out to Mr. Lill to sign that petition?—Certainly he did, and Mr. Lill also.

12318. You had a full understanding that you had a right to proceed at least for that present time, the Committee being sitting?—Yes.

12319. What was the future contingency to depend upon?—At that time Mr. Rogers first stipulated we should give an undertaking to indemnify Mr. Lill; but after hearing a strong opinion from counsel that the House could not order costs, nor could the parties bring actions for libel, I understood Mr. Rogers to waive it; and, as evidence of that, when the Committee adjourned, I thought it my duty to see Mr. Rogers upon the subject, to tell him, if Mr. Lill wished to withdraw his petition I should not attempt to oppose him in it; and Mr. Rogers said it was open, then, if I would see him, for three or four days, and the thing might stand open for that time, but he saw no objection that the petition should be proceeded with if that indemnity before mentioned was given: I left Mr. Rogers then, and saw him no more from that day to this.

12320. Was it a surprise upon you, after the interview upon the staircase, and after your subsequent interview the same day with Mr. Rogers, that a petition should have been presented by Mr. Lill to withdraw his former petition?—Certainly it was.

12321. Now with regard to the commission, do I understand you to say that you were informed by Mr. Robson or Mr. Stokes, that there were many persons whose trade or calling it was to sign subscription deeds of this kind, in respect of shares not belonging to them, for a small commission.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the question.

Mr. *Hill* left it to the Committee to decide whether the question was a proper question.

The *Committee* decided that the question might be put.

Witness.] Yes, they did tell me so.

12322. Have the subsequent inquiries you made, and the information you obtained, led you to doubt the accuracy of the statement?—No; I have no doubt of it.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Francis* was tendered to be examined by Mr. Hill, but Mr. Clarkson declined to examine him.

Mr. *William Yewings*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *W. Yewings.*

12323. Mr. *Hill.*] DID you serve a summons on Mr. Charles John Blunt, at his house, yesterday?—I left one at his house.

12324. Did you inquire for him?—Yes; they said he had not come yet; that it was his office, and they expected him there in the course of the morning. I said I would leave it, and call on my return from the city; I called again, he had not yet come; I then saw the clerk.

12325. What did he say?—He said he would give it him as soon as he came.

12326. Have you been there this morning?—Yes; and Mr. Felix Blunt opened the door for me, and he said he was out of town; that he was at Coventry; that he went on Saturday, and would not be back till Monday next; that he had received a notice.

12327. For himself?—No; for his brother.

12328. Mr. *Clarkson.*] When did you first attempt to serve this summons upon him?—Yesterday morning.

12329. *Chairman.*] Were you then informed he was gone to Coventry?—No; I was told he was expected in the course of the morning.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *W. Yewings.* 2 May 1837.

12330. Mr. *Hill.*] Were you told he was out of town?—No; they told me they expected him in the course of the morning.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated that it was the fault of those who instructed Mr. Hill that Charles John Blunt was not present now, and that he did not see any reason why the parties for whom he appeared should be put to the expense of one or two days more attendance, and he wished the Committee, therefore, to call upon Mr. Hill now to conclude his case, subject to the summing up, or go on with his evidence.

The *Chairman* stated that where it was not shown that a witness was absent by the negligence of the party, it was usual to give a reasonable time for his production at a future period, and that notice had been given to the parties, that they should not summon more witnesses for each day than there was a reasonable probability of their being able to examine.

The *Chairman* inquired of Mr. Clarkson whether he intended to call any evidence.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated that if the evidence remained, as it now stood, he certainly should not call any witnesses.

Mr. *Charles Blunt*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *Charles Blunt.*

12331. ARE you the father of the Mr. Blunt who was engineer to the Southwark and Hammersmith Company?—I am.

12332. Do you know where your son is now?—No, not exactly.

12333. But generally?—Generally, he is on the road to Wolverhampton.

12334. When did he go?—On Saturday or Sunday; I have not seen him for some days; I understand so; I wish to say, in order to account for my uncertainty, that I have been in bed two days from illness.

12335. When is he expected to return?—Not for a week.

12336. Where was he going?—To Coventry, Birmingham, and Wolverhampton.

12337. Can you inform us how he may be addressed there?—Other than at the Post-office I do not know.

12338. Has he left no direction upon the subject?—I have no direct communication with him.

12339. Why do you not say you do not know?—I give you the best answer I can; if you had asked me whether I knew, or not, I should have answered you.

12340. You signed the Southwark and Hammersmith deed, did you?—Yes, I did.

12341. When did you sign it; what was the date of it; when did you sign it the first time?—I do not recollect the month.

12342. I can tell you, it must have been not later than the 10th of November?—I think not; thereabout, probably, I should think it was thereabout.

12343. You signed for 1,900 *l.*?—I did not reckon the amount; I recollect the amount of the shares.

12344. What was it?—I think under 40

12345. It was 38?—That is pretty near

12346. That is 1,900 *l.*?—Yes.

12347. Did you pay any deposits?—No.

12348. Had you the scrip with you at the time?—No

12349. Have you got it now?—I have had it since.

12350. When did you have it?—Some two months afterwards.

12351. Or some three months perhaps?—Thereabout

12352. What is the date of it?—I have not looked at it

12353. Have you got it?—Not here.

12354. But you have it?—Yes.

12355. You will be good enough to send it to the Committee. Did these shares belong to you at all?—Certainly not.

12356. You signed it a second time afterwards; how long afterwards was it?—I think about two months ago.

12357. We are now in May, that would bring it to the beginning of February, was it about that time?—About that time.

12358. At that time it was for 62 shares, making 3,100 *l.*?—Making 150 shares.

12359. *Chairman.*] Making 100 shares altogether?—Yes.

12360. Mr. *Hill.*] But making 3,100 *l.* at that time?—Yes.

12361. How

Mr. *Charles Blunt.*

2 May 1837.

12361. How came you to sign at that time, the beginning of February?—For the same reason that induced me to sign before.

12362. What was that?—You did not ask me.

12363. What was it?—To accommodate the company.

12364. Who asked you to sign it?—I was asked, in fact, by the company, at the instance of my son.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the answer.

12365. Did your son ask you?—Yes, for the company.

12366. Did he state, when he asked you, that he asked you for the company?—Yes, distinctly.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the question.

Mr. *Hill* was heard in support of the question.

The Committee decided that the question might be put.

12367. Mr. *Hill.*] Was your son then in the employment of the company?—Yes.

12368. As their chief engineer?—Yes; and the representative of the company was present.

12369. Who is he?—The legal representative, Mr. Beetham.

12370. He was present at the time?—Yes.

12371. And heard it?—Yes.

12372. Was that at the second signing, or the first?—I think at both; certainly at the first; about the second there can be no doubt; he was present at the signing, and took my signature. I do not know whether he attested it or not; he took it.

12373. Where did your signatures take place?—In the waiting-room belonging to the company.

12374. Where?—In Mansion-house-street.

12375. Was Mr. Beetham present?—Yes.

12376. Was anybody else present?—I think the senior clerk, Mr. Gethen.

12377. Was anybody else; was your son there?—Yes.

12378. Had he brought you there, or who sent you there, or asked you to go there?—My son invited me to go that day; he had invited me to go before; he said now is the time; I am requested to bring you, or words to that effect.

12379. Was anybody else present except yourself, your son, and Mr. Beetham, and the senior clerk?—Nobody else, I should say, was present at that time; different members of the committee were passing in and out of the room.

12380. What do you mean by the committee?—The railway committee.

12381. Do you mean the directors?—Yes.

12382. Have you any interest in this company at all?—None upon earth.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

12383. Your son told you you were to do it for the benefit of the company?—Yes.

12384. You are a gentleman of some experience?—In what?

12385. In life.—I ought to be.

12386. So I should think; have you ever had anything to do with companies before?—No, I never had.

12387. You thought what you were doing was perfectly right?—Yes, I did.

12388. You did it in your innocence?—I believe they were a set of men that would not lead a man into error, or let a man do what he was not competent to do.

12389. Your son is not the engineer to the company now?—No, he has resigned now, fortunately for him.

Re-examined by Mr. *Hill.*

12390. Do you know why he resigned?—Because he could no longer go on with a directory so ill conducted.

12391. Can you give this Committee any facts?—The principal fact is——

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to the question.

The Committee decided that the question had better not be put, so long as there was a chance of having the son himself examined as a witness.

John Edward Stokes, called in; and Examined.

J. E. Stokes.

12392. Mr. *Hill.*] ARE you a member of the Stock Exchange?—I am not now; through the defalcation of my clerk, I am away for a short period; I was responsible for him.

12393. You are not at present a member?—No; I have not been for three weeks.

J. E. Stokes.

2 May 1837.

12394. Do you know the City Railway Company?—Very well.

12395. Have you known it from the first?—From the first.

12396. Do you know Mr. Beetham?—Yes, perfectly well.

12397. How long have you known him?—I should say almost as long as he has been in life; 20 years.

12398. Have you been connected with him in business?—Not directly.

12399. Have you been connected with him at all?—In the year 1825 I was, when there were so many companies.

12400. Which Mr. Beetham?—This Mr. Beetham, who was young at that time, and his brother, the elder one, and the father.

12401. Have you known him many years?—Yes.

12402. In March or April of last year were you applied to by any officer of this company?—I was applied to by Dr. Graham, the chairman, about April, I think.

12403. What did he ask you to do?—He was chairman of the City Railway, and they were going to bring it out in the market, and they wished me to have the management of it in the market; I attended, and I stated to him the system which I would recommend.

12404. What was it?—I would recommend them to issue the shares only to such people who were jobbers in the house and out of the house; and to supply the market, to keep them at a premium; and by degrees to supply the market, when it would bear it, with shares, and support it when it was reduced.

12405. How support it?—By buying shares back again, and then to send in shares when the market could bear it; by which means they would get rid of all their shares.

12406. When did you make this recommendation?—I had several interviews with Dr. Graham and Mr. Binns, and occasionally all the other directors were present. There was a Mr. Busk, an old gentleman; and they were to communicate to the board, and I was to receive my directions from them.

12407. You made your recommendations to those gentlemen?—Yes.

12408. What did they say to the board?—They communicated them to the board.

12409. You do not know that?—No.

12410. What did they tell you?—They told me that my recommendations were to be followed, and the company was to be brought out by the system which I had recommended; but when the company did come out, I found that my plans had not been at all attended to. They had brought out the company in the usual way that a great many others were brought out, sending shares to all the applicants; some men that wrote in ten or twelve names, that had their pockets full of letters.

12411. Did you find, on the Stock Exchange, persons of that description, that had their pockets full of letters?—Yes. The operation I recommended was done away with, and we could not go and buy those shares.

12412. You mean you could not buy those letters?—No.

12413. What was the consequence of this, did the shares fall?—The consequence of my plan was, previous to their coming out, the shares, they were in the market at a premium, and directly this alteration took place, when I found it out, the parties who were to support it with me, I stopped them being saddled with the shares; they had nothing to do with it, and they came out at nothing.

12414. What do you mean by that?—At no premium, or a shilling; and if they had followed my plan, they would have come out at one or two premium.

12415. How long did they remain at par?—They were nominally at par for a short time, but they receded from that, to the present time, to the present discount.

12416. What is the present discount?—One shilling to 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a share, with 2 *l.* paid.

12417. What do you mean?—You can buy them at 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a share. I have been a seller myself, as a broker, for a long time at 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a share; that is, 1 *l.* 17 *s.* 6 *d.* discount.

12418. How long have you been a seller at that rate?—I should say two months.

12419. What was the price before they fell so very low as 1 *s.* or 2 *s.* 6 *d.*?—They dwindled down to one discount.

12420. You are using the word one discount, do you mean that a share was worth 39 *s.*?—No, 1 *l.*, with 2 *l.* paid.

12421. *Chairman.*] You mean 1 *l.* discount?—Yes.

12422. Mr. *Hill.*] How early in the last year were they as low as 1 *l.* discount?—I should say about July or August, because I entered into an operation for the company in October. Oh! no, no; it was after this operation; after the 30th of November.

12423. What was the price?—On the 30th of October their accounts were made up at 1 *l.* per share. [*The Witness referred to a memorandum.*] I bought for the end of November; the accounts were all for the end of November: then the accounts were made up at 20 *s.* per share, that is, 1 *l.* discount. After that, from that to the present time, there has been no possibility of selling any shares in the market to any extent, at any price.

12424. I want first to know the price of shares from April down to the present time; the shares were first at a slight premium in April?—That was before they came out; I named them at that.

12425. Do you buy and sell shares before they come out?—Yes, to a great extent. The day the directors issued the letters, before the shares were brought into the market, they were at a slight premium; about one-sixteenth premium, about 15 *d.*

12426. How long did they remain at a premium?—From that time to the day of payment of the deposits they were from 1 *s.* to 1 *d.* per share, that is, the letter of appropriation.

12427. That must mean the premium?—Yes, the premium upon the letters.

12428. Up to what day?—The day of payment of the deposit.

Mr. *Beetham* stated that the day for the entry of the payment of the deposits was the 20th of April.

12429. What was the state of the market upon the 20th?—There was a party came in and bought up the letters; you could not sell the shares upon which 2 *l.* was paid at par.

12430. I want to know what was the market price at this time?—I should say half discount to par per share.

12431. From 30 *s.* to 40 *s.*?—Yes, per share.

12432. How long did they remain at that?—They remained about that price nominally; there was no improvement, nor much depreciation, for two or three months.

12433. Was there much done in them?—No, I do not think there was.

12434. From the 20th April what was done with them; you say, they remained at this nominal price two or three months; at the end of that time what was the market price?—Lower still and depreciated; there was no support to the market; they never improved at all; they were never at a premium until an operation took place, which I am called to prove; one-half discount, three-eighths discount; there was no improvement in price.

12435. Three months from the beginning of April would bring us to July; what was the market price of these shares in the month of August?—I cannot say nearer than this; I should say three-fourths to a quarter discount.

12436. What does that mean?—1 *l.* 5 *s.* to 1 *l.* 15 *s.*; there was a little traffic in them, but they were never at a premium.

12437. Now come to your operation?—The market remained in that state some time, until the secretary, Mr. Binns, came to me, and said the directors have made a pretty mess of this business by not following your recommendations, and they are now quite convinced of their want of knowledge of business.

Mr. *Clarkson* submitted to the Committee, whether the directors of this company were to be impeached by this sort of evidence.

The *Chairman* observed, it was what their secretary had stated.

12438. Mr. *Hill.*] Proceed?—And they had come to a resolution to adopt what recommendations you may think proper to recover the company, and to enable them to get out of the remaining shares.

12439. Give us the date of this conversation as nearly as you can?—This was about the middle of October. I said the only way you can do is, to buy up all the shares about the 'Change, as well as you can, for money, and buy a great many shares in the Stock Exchange for time; do not employ one man, but employ as many as you can.

12440. Now come to the operation?—Mr. Binns told me he was, and I saw he was buying a great many shares; I saw him buy a great many shares through other people.

12441. What did he pay for them?—It was for time, for the account.

J. E. Stokes.

2 May 1837.

12442. What did he buy them in at?—I can only say what he bought them in at through me, it was three-eighths discount, that is, 1*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* per share; that is for the account for the end of the month, the 31st October, to take the shares at the end of the month. I told him this was the plan what I would do with them, and I wrote it down here, and it is signed by his own name. I wrote down the system: "Buy one hundred shares for the end of November;" this is November, not October.

12443. What are you speaking of?—November, not October; my operation with him was in November.

12444. *Chairman.*] It was the middle of November, instead of the middle of October?—Yes, it was; here is my official book, in which every day is put in; it was early in November; he was to buy a hundred shares at three-eighths or a quarter discount, and leave 50 or 60 shares as a deposit to cover any loss there may be on that day, if not convenient to take them. I went into the market to do those 100 shares. It is signed by Mr. Binns; it is said, "J. Binns authorizes Mr. Stokes to make the above bargain with Mr. Robson, or other equally good." When I came back I found he had altered the 100 into 500.

12445. Was this at the railway office?—No; at my office, in the presence of the junior clerk.

12446. What is his name?—Prestage, he is at the office now.

12447. You found he had altered the figures to 500?—Yes.

12448. In your book?—In his order. I said I did not mean 500 with only 50 or 60 shares; but 50 or 60 shares for 100; therefore I must have a larger proportion; for though your directors may all individually be very respectable men, there may be some dispute amongst them when the account day comes, and I must have money in my hand to protect myself, or shares as a security. The next day, when he was to have given me those shares, but did not give them to me, he brought me 30, and he said he had done considerable business with other brokers, and they were quite satisfied with 30 shares per hundred as a security.

12449. Do you mean he brought you 30 or 300?—Thirty; I had only done 100; I did another hundred a few days afterwards; he was doing business with others.

12450. Did he bring you the 30?—Yes; and I did a third hundred for him between that and the period of the settlement; the first hundred was the 25th of October, the second the 6th of November, the third hundred was on the 7th or 8th of November; I am not quite sure there was only that bargain done between the 6th and 8th; that was on the 8th of November; here it is; it was all done for time, for the end of November.

12451. Did he deposit thirty upon the third hundred?—Yes; I had 90 shares. I wrote to him the day before the account day, in which I requested him to be early in the morning on the account day, either with the company's draft——

12452. Have you a copy of it?—I gave a copy of it to Mr. Bircham; it is only a slip of paper; I can tell you the exact words, or nearly so; it was something to this effect.

12453. *Chairman.*] What was the account day?—The 30th of November.

12454. Tell us what passed?—"Dear Sir;" it was the night before, this is something of a copy: "I recommend you to be early in the market, either with the company's draft or cash to take the shares, in order that the jobbers may not suppose that it is a mere speculation, but an investment; for my impression is, that they are bears, and it will raise the market." They sold the shares without having them, that is what I meant; if he had been early in the morning, it would have convinced them.

12455. Mr. *Hill.*] What is the meaning of this translated into common English?—Men who sell what they have not got, in hopes of their going down.

12456. And therefore they must buy in?—Yes; buy them cheaper or dearer, they must deliver them to time. I saw Mr. Binns several times on the account day; he never wrote me any answer to it; but sent me word he would see me early in the morning. I saw him several times on the account day. "I shall be with you directly with the money; I am battling it with the directors, who have treated me very ill." Twelve o'clock, one, two and three o'clock came; I was waiting anxiously the money to take my shares; and the last of it was, I told him I had not the money to take them myself, and if he did not bring me the money I was in an awkward situation, I could not pay the 500*l.*; he said, appoint the jobbers and yourself to meet me at the Auction Mart Coffeehouse at half-past four and I will

be

be ready with the money; and I did so, and he came to his appointment, and he told us we should have the money at nine o'clock; that he should send up to the west end of the town for it, and so he told us hour after hour and day after day, for three or four days; that he was battling it with the directors and sending in all directions to the west end of the town to raise the money; until at last I came to the determination to go before the directors and have some decided understanding.

12457. Did you go before them?—I wrote to the directors, and I went before them; but previous to that I wrote to them.

12458. Have you got a copy of the letter you wrote to them?—No; we do not keep any books, this is all the books we keep.

12459. Did you keep any copy of the letter?—No; I did not, unless it is here. No, it is not.

12460. According to your account, that would be about the 5th of December?—Mr. *Beetham* stated that they had no copy of any such letter.

12461. Mr. *Hill.*] Who was it directed to?—To the directors, and one of the directors called upon me the second of December.

12462. What was the object of your letter?—To get the directors to let me have the money, or become surety.

12463. Mr. *Forster.*] How was the letter sent; by the twopenny post?—By my boy most likely. Here is a note of it. On the second of December, Mr. Walker, the deputy chairman, came to my office at about five o'clock, and there were present the jobbers who had sold me the shares; and he stated that Mr. Binns, the secretary, had 100 shares lodged with them, which they had advanced him some salary on account of: that they had given him some salary in advance.

12464. As a security for those shares?—Yes.

12465. Go on?—This 100 shares would just pay my account down to the nominal market price.

12466. What was the nominal market price?—1 *l.* per share.

12467. Was that the price you had bought them at?—No; 1 *l.* 12 *s.* 6 *d.* per share; there was a loss of 12 *s.* 6 *d.*

12468. Was that 1 *l.* the price the jobbers would take as the difference?—It was the nominal price of the market, and as long as they had security to that amount they would hold them as a temporary security till the money was paid for the original purchase.

12469. They would consider each share as worth 20 *s.*, provided security were given to them by the company to pay the difference between the 20 *s.* and the price at which they had sold?—No; that is quite distinct, that was only the nominal price of the market at that period; the nominal price was a pound, you could not sell them at 12 *s.*; but the jobbers said, if you will give us security for one pound a share, we have no objection to wait till the cash is produced for the amount of the original contract.

12470. The securities which the jobbers demanded was a security of 1 *l.* a share —Yes.

12471. And then they will wait some time?—Yes; a day or two.

12472. For the difference?—Yes.

12473. *Chairman.*] Tell us who the jobbers are?—I mentioned it on behalf of the jobbers.

12474. Mr. *Hill.*] To whom?—To Mr. Walker and Mr. Binns; they were both present, and the jobbers, who were all together at my office.

12475. You were spokesman for the jobbers?—Yes; they had nothing to do with Mr. Walker or Mr. Binns, or the company.

12476. What did Mr. Walker say?—He said the company had 100 shares of Mr. Binns', which they held as some security for some salary they had advanced him, and he had no objection to pass his word he would give me those 100 shares the next day, if I would call at the office; the next morning of course I was punctual, you may rely upon it, for my own credit; I called and saw Mr. Walker and Mr. Binns, and Mr. Walker gave me possession of 100 shares in the presence of Mr. Binns; he said I give you these 100 shares, the property of Mr. Binns, by his wish. Then I waited a day or two more patiently, in hopes that the directors or he would find the money. Not doing that, I had two interviews with the board, I think; one I am certain of.

12477. Who were there?—I believe all the directors, or a dozen of them.

12478. Mention some names?—I saw the chairman, Mr. Dakeyne, and I think

J. E. Stokes.

2 May 1835.

Mr. Walker, I am not quite sure; there were from nine to twelve gentlemen present, and I stated to them what I have stated to you.

It appeared from the minutes that there were present that day, Mr. Dakeyne, in the chair; Richard Cooke, esq.; B. W. Beetham, esq.; F. Polhill, esq.; H. Busk, esq.; J. T. Goode, esq.; J. H. Walker, esq.; and J. H. Disney.

I stated to them what I have stated to you about these transactions.

12479. You explained the transactions to them?—Yes; and I told them I considered I was doing it on their account, and that I expected them to pay me the amount, which they declined altogether. They said I knew that Mr. Binns, their secretary, had been doing considerable business on his own account; that they had warned him of it, but they had nothing whatever to do with it. I told them I was convinced of it, as it was a very common practice.

12480. Mr. *Forster.*] What was a common practice?—For such operations to be made by the officers of the company with brokers, on account of the directors, when they did not give the orders sometimes through their solicitor; not in this case, but generally through their secretary. Dr. Graham was the chairman; he knew all about it; he was present, not when I did this business, but he knew I did it.

12481. Mr. *Hill.*] But you have told us that he knew it after it was done?—While I was doing it.

12482. When did he know it?—At the time I had the orders; he was a principal of mine: I told him I was doing largely for the company; he told me he knew it, and that others were doing largely too. I told him I should sell out the shares against the company in the open market, and I should hold them responsible for the difference.

12483. Mr. *Forster.*] What is the meaning of selling them out against the company?—You must, legally, to make a sale against parties who have purchased them, make a sale; if they were to remain open till now they would not be worth half the amount, and you must close the account.

12484. Mr. *Hill.*] Is that all the interview?—Yes, that was all.

12485. Did you leave them upon that?—Yes.

12846. Did you make a sale?—Yes; and I wrote them an official notice I should make a sale.

12487. What is the date of the sale?—On the 12th of December.

12488. What was the price at which you sold?—The prices were one discount; it was a very great turn to the directors; they were sold to the jobbers themselves to make up the account, to close it; we could not get 10 *s.* for them in the market, and we sold them to the jobbers because the security then would have covered nearly the amount.

12489. What was the price in the market?—I could not have sold 50 shares at 10 *s.* a share; this is the account: "300 shares bought, at 3-8ths discount, 487 *l.* 10 *s.*; commission 15 *l.*—502 *l.* 10 *s.* 490 sold;" that was the 90 security, and 100 given me by the deputy chairman, at 1 discount, that comes to 490 *l.*, leaving a balance due to me of 12 *l.* 10 *s.* I sent that account to the directors, and have had no answer. I sent it likewise to Mr. Binns, and have had no answer.

12490. You have not got the 12 *l.* 10 *s.*?—No.

12491. Did the shares rise or fall, or remain stationary after that time?—From that time to the present day they have been totally unsaleable; for, in consequence of this and other transactions of a larger extent with other brokers, the jobbers set their faces against the company altogether, and they would no further deal with them than as there was a chance of getting out of what they had on hand.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

12492. You proposed a scheme of your own to the directors?—Yes.

12493. As a sort of accoucheur to them?—I was.

12494. And which would have been a delivery if your plan had been adopted, and which turned out an abortion, because it was not?—It did.

12495. You have a friendly feeling towards them?—I have no ill feeling to them; I think they treated me very ill for not taking the shares.

12496. You have no ill feeling towards them?—No.

12497. You

12497. You have, on the contrary, commiseration for them?—I do not know about that.

12498. What is the price of the Southampton shares?—I think about two or three and twenty discount.

12499. What money has been paid upon them?—Forty pounds paid. It is 15*l.* or 16*l.* a share.

12500. They are rather heavy goods in the market?—Rather heavy.

12501. Have the jobbers set their faces against them?—The jobbers will not buy any of them; they have got enough.

12502. Have you had a touch at the Southampton shares yourself?—I do not deal for myself.

12503. Never?—Never; I might do such a thing as a bargain once in six months.

12504. That is, what a man does who does deal in them, but you say you do not?—Yes.

12505. Do you mean to tell the Committee you are not a jobber?—Yes; not generally.

12506. Do you not know, in consequence of your representations to the directors, of the conduct of Mr. Binns, that Mr. Binns was, by these very directors, immediately discharged?—No; I do not think it was in consequence of my representations.

12507. What was it then?—I think it was in consequence of the deed of the company having been placed in the hands of another broker for a larger operation.

12508. Had he done it?—Some person had.

12509. He was discharged for it?—That was my impression.

12510. Have you seen him since?—Yes.

12511. Do you not know that the company have discharged him?—Not on my account.

12512. Do you not know that the company have discharged him?—Yes. No; that he had discharged the company.

12513. Do you mean to say that?—Yes.

12514. Have you seen the advertisement they have published?—I have seen a small advertisement, saying, "Jonas Binns is no longer secretary to the company."

12515. Was it signed by the solicitor?—I do not know who it was signed by.

12516. Was it signed by Mr. Binns, as he had discharged the company?—I know nothing of his affairs with the company; it was a common advertisement.

12517. How did Mr. Bircham, the attorney for the Southampton Railway, fish you up as a witness?—That is best known to himself.

12518. How did you first become acquainted with him?—Mr. Green came to me, and said, you had some transactions with the City Railway.

12519. When was that?—It was about a fortnight ago.

12520. Will you allow me to ask you, have you been in attendance every day the Committee have been sitting?—Yes.

12521. What do you expect to get?—I have no promise of anything.

12522. I know you have not; I therefore ask you what you expect?—I shall expect my expenses.

12523. What should you consider a charge as for time?—I am entitled to a guinea a day in a court of law, but I would give two guineas to get away.

12524. To be on the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

12525. But you cannot get in?—No; but I can do my business there as well: it is only a temporary thing; it is my clerk's defalcation.

12526. But if your clerk says it was nobody's concern but your own, it would be like the case of Mr. Binns?—My creditors are satisfied I had nothing to do with it; it was a breach of trust in my clerk, and I have nothing to do with it.

12527. And yet you are not on the Exchange?—No, till it is investigated. It is necessary I should either pay a certain sum of money, or, as in this case, the party shall be readmitted without paying a farthing.

12528. You say that you have sustained inconvenience, and indeed loss, by means of the defalcation of the person who acted as your clerk?—Yes.

12529. But for that loss, do you mean to represent to the Committee you are a man of substance?—No, I do not. I have not said anything of the kind.

12530. What is the amount of the loss?—The amount of the loss was only 250*l.*

J. E. Stokes.

2 May 1837.

12531. Are you and Mr. Green acquaintances together?—No; no acquaintances at all.

12532. When did you first know him?—I have done business for him as a man who has bought shares for me to sell.

12533. How long?—Three or four years.

12534. Is he one of the dealers in shares that waits outside?—I believe he is.

12535. I have a curiosity to know who the gentlemen were that had their pockets full of letters; give us one?—A whole lot of them.

12536. Give us one?—I do not know the names.

12537. Try?—They are people I do not mix with at all.

12538. Try, or we may doubt it; tell us one?—I do not mix with them.

12539. How came you to see them?—They were on the Exchange, passing them about, with five or six letters in their hands, selling them at twopence a share.

12540. Cannot you tell one that has had a misfortune with his clerk?—I do not mix with them at all.

12541. You do not know them?—I can point them out to you.

12542. Have you had any dabbling in shares since this unfortunate transaction?—No.

12543. You have not taken any Southampton shares?—No.

Re-examined by Mr. *Hill.*

12544. When you proposed that plan, was that plan or not acceded to by the directors?—Yes; I understood so.

12545. Was it so or not?—I understood Dr. Graham and Mr. Binns that it was.

12546. Had you any instructions from either of those gentlemen to do anything?—No; I was to wait till the shares came out.

12547. Did they prepare anything in writing?—No; we do not have anything in writing in those cases. I was to wait till the company came out.

12548. Had they a list at this time; did you mark any list at that time for them?—Yes; they gave me a list book, which contained a list of shares.

12549. Who did?—Mr. Binns.

12550. Was Dr. Graham there at that time?—Yes; and several of the gentlemen were there, and clerks.

12551. They gave you a book?—Yes; in which was a list of all the applicants for shares.

12552. Did they tell you to do anything with it?—Yes; I marked the names in that book that I thought were efficient men to assist our operations, to whom shares might be sent; and I wrote in pencil at the end of the book other names of eminent jobbers, or jobbers to whom shares were to be sent, that they may assist the operation, who never wrote for shares and never would write; but it was necessary for them to have a certain number of shares as a sort of protection in the operation. I was to have had 300, and those gentlemen were to have 100, and some 50, and some 200.

12553. Was that carried into effect?—No.

12554. Did you mark the book by their direction, and in their presence?—Yes.

12555. Mr. *Clarkson.*] How many ticks did you make to efficient names in the list?—I should think from 30 to 40.

12556. That is, cursorily looking over the list?—Yes.

[The Witness withdrew.

It was arranged that Mr. Hill should proceed to observe on the evidence on Thursday next; and that Mr. Clarkson should not be called upon to state whether he would call witnesses until after the conclusion of Mr. Hill's summing up.

Jovis, 4° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. Warburton.
Mr. Forster.	

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Hill* stated that Mr. Bircham had been informed by his clerk, that, on passing along Fleet-street last evening, he had seen Charles John Blunt; that a notice had been sent to him, requesting his attendance this morning, but that he was not now in waiting; that he made no application to the Committee upon the subject, but merely mentioned the circumstance.

The *Chairman* stated, that if Mr. Blunt's attendance were considered as indispensable, he would mention the subject to The Speaker; but it did not appear to him that the evidence of Mr. Blunt was very material for the information of the Committee.

Mr. *Hill* stated that there were certain lists which Mr. Clarkson had undertaken to produce, but which had not yet been produced, namely, a list of the parties applying for shares, and the result of the application.

Mr. *Beetham* stated that the return was preparing, and would be ready in a few minutes.

Mr. *Hill* proceeded to sum up the evidence which had been produced in support of the petitions.

Mr. *Charles John Blunt*, called in; and Examined by Mr. *Hill*.

Mr. *C. J. Blunt*.

4 May 1837.

12557. HAVE you received the summons of this Committee?—I understand that a summons was left at my office.

12558. Did not your clerks give it to you?—I have been to Coventry; I went there on Saturday night, and returned on Tuesday, at mid-day.

12559. Are you the engineer of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company?—I conceived myself on the 18th of March last to be so.

12560. Have you persons to represent you in the subscription deed?—I obtained certain signatures to that deed.

12561. What signatures?—Charles Blunt, Felix Blunt, John Earle, and George Harris.

12562. Have you any shares in the undertaking?—I have not.

12563. Have you ever had any shares?—I have had; I took shares conditionally; those conditions being broken by the company, I ceased to be a shareholder.

12564. What was the condition?—I was to take 400 *l.* worth of shares, meaning, 200 shares on the guarantee of the directors and solicitor that it was their *bonâ fide* intention to proceed to Parliament, and to obtain an act of incorporation.

12565. Who was present at this agreement with the directors?—Mr. Cooke, Mr. Walker, Mr. Disney, Mr. A. W. Beetham, Sir W. Rawlins, and, I believe, Capt. Polhill and other members.

12566. At what time was this?—At various periods during the last four months.

12567. When did the negotiation begin?—A distinct matter of business was made of it early in last December.

12568. When was it first talked about?—About three months prior to that, the chairman told me I was expected to take shares.

12569. Was this at a board meeting?—Yes.

12570. Who was then the chairman?—Mr. Dakeyne.

12571. Were other officers of the company expected to take shares?—I believe they were, but I was not present.

12572. What took place in December last?—I was called upon early in last December

Mr. *C. J. Blunt.*

4 May 1837.

December to make a distinct debtor and creditor account between myself, as engineer, and the company. I was called upon early in last year to give the company the lowest possible estimate of monies which would be required to furnish the committee with such drawings, designs, estimate and engineering evidence as would be required to be brought in evidence in support of the Bill before the House of Commons; I did so, and the result of that estimate in amount was 1,740*l.*, exclusive of extras; because it distinctly stated the work, and the nature, and the quantity of it which was to be performed. I received a resolution of the board to proceed with those drawings, designs, estimate and engineering evidence; it was on the 18th of last June that this resolution was communicated to me. I proceeded with and completed them about the middle of last November, upon the distinct understanding that it was a cash transaction, as I had given a minimum estimate for a maximum quantity of work, and also that I should not out of that sum be expected to be a shareholder of the company, which I have all along refused to be. Upon this estimate I have received from time to time various sums of money, without mention being made till very lately that the company was anxious I should take some shares in part payment of that estimate. On this communication I told the directors that I could not consent to be a shareholder under any circumstances; above all, to appear on the face of the deed. I was asked, and I stated as my reasons, that I should not be considered as admissible to appear before the Committee to give evidence on the Bill, as well as that I should probably damnify my right to recover against the company, by constituting myself a partner. To the propriety of this refusal, after some difficulty, they assented, but stating, "We fear our funds will not enable us to combat anticipated difficulty in the House of Commons," and they again proposed to me to take shares in some other way. I stated, that on that estimate it was impossible for me to take anything but money; that I was already out of pocket, when I had paid the liabilities I had incurred on behalf of the company. They then proposed to me to take shares in the company, on the understanding that should I require to be paid for them again, and should the company not proceed to Parliament, would there be any objection on my part to take a certain number of shares to enable them to proceed with a sufficient subscription to warrant their passing the Standing Orders of the House? To this proposition I assented, with the provision, that neither I nor the parties whom I might obtain to subscribe to the subscription deed were any of them severally or individually liable or responsible to the company; neither myself damnified as a shareholder, nor required, should I pay deposits on those shares, to keep them, if I felt disinclined under any circumstances to do so; and, above all, that it in no way interfered with my present claims for any estimated balance then in their hands, and for certain extras over and above and independent of that estimate, which the company had at sundry times required of me. They said, to these observations, there would be some difficulty; these parties must appear to be shareholders, or yourself must appear to be a shareholder. I was asked distinctly by the directors, and by several of them in particular, to state in writing that I was willing to become a shareholder, to give the transaction sufficient colour of truth to warrant their safety; to prevent, in fact, my turning round, as one or two of them said I might by possibility do. I was incautious and unbusiness-like enough to commit to paper an application for shares, at the suggestion and at the advice and solicitation of the company, of the directors themselves, with the communicated assurance that I should at no time be called upon to keep those shares.

12573. What was the time when you made this application?—In the early part of December; I left with them my letter on the 5th of December.

12574. We call for that now?—I should suggest, that, if that letter is put in evidence, the whole of it ought to be read.

[*The following letter was put in and read:*]

To the Chairman and Directors of the City Railway Company.

Gentlemen, 5 December 1836.

In compliance with your instructions, to deliver my account against the company by this morning, I beg to state it, as follows:

For all professional charges, of whatever kind, including all plans, estimates, attendances, &c. &c.,—professional charges up to July, 200*l.*

Estimates

Estimates and Plans,
From the 18th of July, as per estimate delivered to the Board.
By order, and entered on the Minutes.

The cash received is, up to this day - - - - - - -	£. 996
By shares - - - - - - - - - - - -	300
	£. 1,296

Balance due on the completion of the works, 444 *l.*

I beg to state, that having taken shares as cash, the money actually received is 996 *l.*

I am, gentlemen, your most obedient humble servant,
Charles John Blunt.

P.S.—This estimate includes every charge for attending Parliament, and whatever services may be at any time required until the Bill be obtained, and I am willing to give any undertaking to this effect the Board may require. Should it be of any moment to the Board, I am willing to take a further number of shares towards my balance, and obtain the proper signatures to the deed, as my friends will advance cash on them to me. I will take 100 more shares at par, if the company proceed to Parliament; otherwise I receive the balance of 444 *l.*
5 Dec. 1836. *C. J. B.*

12575. Where was this letter written?—In the office of the company; in their upper office, up stairs.

12576. Was it at the same period at which you had come to the agreement in words?—This was in December; my agreement with the company was in June, as to the amount.

12577. You say in December the subject of your taking shares took a business-like shape?—Yes.

12578. You had a conference with the directors which you mentioned to the Committee?—Yes.

12579. Was it in consequence of that conference you wrote this letter?—It was.

12580. Did you write it at that time?—Yes.

12581. And bring it to the room at that time?—It was delivered to them by my father; he was at the board that day.

12582. You gave it to him for the purpose of delivery?—It was delivered to the board I know.

12583. If I understand you right, your contract with the directors included your giving evidence before the Committee?—Yes, as far as 1,740 *l.* went; there were extras to this, which was the subject of a future bargain.

12584. However, the attendance upon the Committee, or a portion of it, was part of the 1,750 *l.*, was it?—£. 1,740.

12585. Now you have stated that the directors knew you were to be represented upon this deed by other persons; you took the shares?—I took the shares for the accommodation of the company.

12586. From your statement it appears the directors knew you were to be represented upon this deed, not in your own person, but by others?—Decidedly; it was the understanding that I should not appear there under any circumstances whatsoever.

12587. Are you sure you told the directors why you could not appear upon the deed?—Distinctly?

12588. Say shortly what was the reason?—The reason I knew I could not appear on the deed was, that which I had given them at every board-day perhaps for a month previous to that; namely, that I should consider that I damnified any claim I might have on the company, being a partner; I felt that I should have to litigate my claims with them, and I would not put myself in a situation to be called a partner by any transaction which might take place. Then they went into the consideration of who I should obtain to sign the deed; I stated the parties who have subsequently signed it; that is, my father, brother, and two of my assistants, Earle and Harris, two clerks.

12589. Where did Harris sign these shares?—At the City Railway Company's office.

12590. Where did Earle sign?—At the office in the city. This, I must be allowed to observe, is to the best of my belief; I will not be positive to Earle, I took Harris down.

12591. Now, do you know of any other persons upon the deed being the nominees of the real parties?—Yes.

Mr. C. J. Blunt.

4 May 1837.

12592. Who?—If I had a copy of the subscription list, I might tell you in a moment. I know that Arnold has not paid deposits, for a very good reason, he could not.

12593. Whose nominee is he?—I think he signed for Mr. Laxton; there are certain names of the directors of the company there, who have signed, not having paid the deposits.

12594. You have pointed to the name of John Henry Walker; do you mean him?—Yes; he has paid no deposit for the last shares signed for; that was one of the many reasons which induced me to retire peremptorily from the company.

12595. Tell us what it was that induced you to retire?—I found, Sir, that about that period the directors contemplated not acting *bonâ fide*. Some of my papers are in the country now, and I am at some loss for written documents on the part of the company, and which I should be very glad to put in; should this question be prolonged another day or two, I shall doubtless be able to put in documents of some moment to the question, and not in its favour too. I found that at the time these signatures were affixed to the deed, Henry Walker for one, that they signed the deed without *bonâ fide* paying a single shilling on them.

12596. How did you find it out?—I found it out in this way; that these directors were unwilling to put their hands into their pockets for another farthing, though they wanted me to remain a shareholder.

12597. My question is, how did you know this?—I was present at the board, and heard it.

12598. Will you tell us about the time?—I can tell you to-morrow, if the Committee will permit me.

12599. Will you tell us about the time?—I should think it was about the middle of March, the early part of March; but I must be excused from speaking positively to that date. I cannot tell exactly; I never depend on my memory.

12600. Did you make a memorandum of it?—Yes; and which I can attest as being written at the time.

12601. When can you produce it?—To-morrow; and I can bring one of the parties belonging to the institution itself who saw it written.

12602. Who is he?—A clerk of mine, of the name of Earle.

12603. You were at the board at one time; now will you tell us what took place at that time?—It was on a question with the directors how they were to have a sufficient number of signatures to that deed to warrant their passing the Standing Orders of the House, and to go through certain readings, certain stages of the bill, as required by the Standing Orders: several of the directors, and John Henry Walker among the rest, stated that they would not put down another shilling, and he for a very simple reason, that he could not, but that it might be done in this way by the directors, who were entitled, as they conceived, to the remuneration of certain guineas for attendances at the board, although the validity of the claim for the guineas was strenuously opposed by certain of its members.

12604. Tell us the names of those who opposed it?—Captain St. Leger was one who opposed it, and Hans Busk; others I do not remember at the moment.

12605. Captain Polhill, did he oppose it?—I do not know that I can speak distinctly to the parties, for I heard them speaking against it; and they themselves knew that it was unfair and improper in the then state of their finances, it having been so communicated to them by their officers, and by certain of their board, that it would be fraudulent to withdraw money for their own appropriation; they nevertheless drew upon that occasion certain sums of money upon the bankers of the company, on the one hand, to pay themselves for their attendances upon the board, in violation of certain resolutions to the contrary that they were eligible to be paid, and paid them with the other into the hands of the banker; I believe, to the best of my recollection, to colour and to cover the signatures pointed out in that subscription list.

12606. The *Chairman.*] Who were the officers and the certain members of the board by whom you state it was communicated to them that, in their opinion, this would be a fraudulent proceeding?—It was stated at several times, of course mildly and properly; but to the certain effect, that if they had their feelings about them, (both by myself and Mr. Laxton,) that it was improper in the then state of their finances, when they were begging that we should hold off our claims upon them, to help themselves to the funds.

12607. Mr. *Hill.*] Who are the officers you allude to; who are the members of the

the board you allude to as having communicated to them that, in their opinion, it would be a fraudulent proceeding to withdraw any money for their own purposes? —Captain St. Leger and Hans Busk were the two parties.

12608. It is what passed at this board, you know?—Yes; at this board I stated to the chairman himself that I had been unfairly and ungenerously used with regard to the shares which they had prevailed upon me to take colourably, and not *bonâ fide*; and I felt that it was the intention of the company to hold me to that bargain, although, I am ashamed to say, being a party to it, a concocted one, and that I should forthwith on the morrow demand the balance of my account. Various excuses were made to me upon pressing the matter upon them, and finally I found my worst anticipations of the company's honour and integrity realized. I prevailed upon a member of the board to summon a special meeting of the directors, and communicate to them that I had heard, while they were in committee at various times, particularly the last two or three meetings, that it was not the intention of any of the parties to proceed *bonâ fide* into Parliament. Such meeting was called; and I am now speaking of a day subsequent to the day that the resigning of the directors took place. Such board was called, and I appeared before it to prefer my claims upon the company, and to express my determined resolution of entirely withdrawing from the services of the company, giving them for reason, that their intentions, not being *bonâ fide*, were not honourable; and that as I had been made one of the largest sufferers in the undertaking, I felt sore on that account, and I felt that however unimportant an individual I might be considered by certain parties to be, I yet felt that no honourable mind, nor no man who was influenced by the smallest spark of commercial integrity, could remain with them. This was stated to them during a conversation of several hours. I explained various illegal proceedings of the company, and, among the rest, their violently and in bad faith retaining 400 *l.* of my money in their hands, in breach of a *bonâ fide* engagement, and having prevailed upon me to suspend a claim of 285 *l.* more, making my balance 685 *l.*; and further, that it was my intention forthwith to secede from the service of the company. I was then informed by certain of the directors that it would be highly dishonourable on my part, and a blasting of my reputation and professional integrity for ever, to leave the company at that stage of the proceedings, and which would cause its probable ruin. I stated, "My duty to you as individuals and as directors has ceased; but that, as a professional man and an honourable man, I owe a duty to the subscribers, which I will conscientiously and honourably perform; namely, that having been advertised as the engineer of the company, and certain of my friends expecting that the undertaking had *bonâ fide* intentions, they would expect me to remain to give it all possible professional service, and push it with my best professional exertions through Parliament." I therefore said to the subscribers as a body, "I owe you an obligation, and I will give you my evidence." And I here state, that having undertaken, as regards the subscribers, to give my evidence, I will willingly give it now; and though I said to the directors, I cease from your service, I hold myself willing and ready when called on to do my duty to the subscribers in the undertaking as regards the engineering evidence in Parliament; and further, that on no account would I submit to be advertised as the officer of the board, and whenever spoken of in public committee, or otherwise, I should be spoken of as the engineer giving his evidence in support of the undertaking, and not as its officer. One of the directors, Albert William Beetham, and the solicitor, at the same time stated to me that that would be ruin to the company, as the shareholders themselves would be sure to take hold of a scheme of that sort, and wonder why I left the undertaking as an officer, while I remained to give my evidence. My reply was, I cannot help the gross mismanagement of which your board of directors have been guilty with regard to this undertaking; I shall only consider whether I am successful in obtaining my balance of the company, for I consider that I have acted an honourable and straightforward part, and performed all I undertook to do for the board, and a great deal more, notwithstanding I have retired from the company; and only in consideration of my having been before the public and before the subscribers as the engineer to the undertaking. They endeavoured to prevail on me to remain, by stating, and they have stated it before certain parties belonging to them, whom I should be glad to call in evidence, if I have my own petition entertained, that they could not, and would not, accept my resignation,—could not, because injurious to them; and would not, because they considered my claims thus

Mr. *C. J. Blunt*.

4 May 1837.

unsettled upon the company would be a sufficient inducement to make me remain, I had my solicitor in attendance on that occasion.

12609. Was he in attendance on the board?—No; with me, as my adviser generally.

12610. What was his name?—Mr. Waithman Miller; and upon his advice I acted.

12611. Which was, what?—That having written my resignation to the board on the 18th of March, which resignation is docketed, and among the papers of the company, and having been threatened by the company with coercive measures to induce me to remain, I publicly advertised a peremptory retirement from the company. It was so advertised in two or three of the morning papers, and since that period I have been known to the body of the subscribers to this undertaking, and to my professional brethren at large, no longer to form one of the members of the body. Now, gentlemen, you have arrived at the stage of my secession from the company.

12612. When did this secession take place?—On the 18th of March; but the public announcement of it was on the 18th of April.

12613. Why was it not announced sooner?—Because I had not considered the matter sufficiently ripe; I had hoped the company would have proceeded to Parliament with *bonâ fide* intentions, and, as regards myself, a positive fraud would not have been attempted.

12614. What do you mean by the company proceeding to Parliament with *bonâ fide* intentions?—I know the company are only proceeding to such a stage before the Committee of this House as shall warrant them in saying to the subscribers, "We have made our best possible exertions to obtain an act of incorporation, and having done so, your funds are at an end:" whereas, if the company are not suffered to have a *locus standi*, or to have it said they have not been in the House at all—upon this I acted, and advised others to act—that if the company can be shown as not having *bonâ fide* intentions, they had no right to come before this Honourable House at all; and this was one of the reasons for my secession from the company; but I could not and would not see a professional man be a party to any such transaction.

12615. The *Chairman*.] What are those documents you allude to in the evidence and which you are desirous of having referred to the Committee?—It is a memorandum.

12616. I ask what is the nature of those memoranda you refer to, for which you allege your desire for the Committee to sit another day?—One of the documents has a memorandum made at the back by myself, which will point out the date that these colourable signatures took place; and another is a letter of the board, which distinctly shows in black and white, and by the signature of the chairman of the company, that the shares I did sign for was simply a colourable transaction, and was not a *bonâ fide* taking of the shares.

12617. Those documents can be forwarded to the Committee to-morrow?—Yes. May I be permitted to observe, that as one of those documents is particularly necessary to the making out a case of mine in another court, I trust it will be returned to me again.

12618. Mr. *Hill*.] Where are these documents?—In the country, they are in Coventry; they will be at my office to-day.

12619. Are they there now?—No, they cannot be; they will be to-day.

12620. Have you pointed out any persons, or are there to your knowledge any more persons, who, besides those named, have, in your opinion, no real interest respecting shares they have subscribed for?—I know there is the name of Verbeke; I know that no deposit is paid on those shares; that is one.

12621. Is there any other name?—There is the name of Miller.

12622. That we know of?—I apprehend that the learned counsel is in possession of these names before.

12623. Read the last column, and see if there is any name there that you happen to know is the name of a person not morally interested in the transaction; read all that you know?—I know Henry Laxton is not; Daniel Henry Martin is not; I know that James Macnamara is not a *bonâ fide* shareholder to the amount put down in this list; I have heard him say before the committee that he had made himself responsible for those shares, and if these deposits have been made on the shares, it was with the company's money; I have heard him say he has signed the deed without

without having paid his deposit; I heard him say that before his own committee, and the solicitor has stated the same thing.

12624. What has Mr. Beetham said?—He has given a reason why my clerk should sign the deed for a further number of shares, and that he would sign it if he were not an officer, but that Mr. Macnamara had.

12625. Go through the other names?—Henry Miller; he has not paid deposits; I know that from himself. Henry Beetham has not paid deposits.

12626. Do you know that from himself?—I only know that he cannot pay them Charles Theodore Verbeke, he has not; Northhouse, I believe, he has let that matter be cleared by leaving 50 *l.* in their hands as for services performed. Henry Holland; I have heard your address to the Committee——

12627. You are only required to state what you know of your own knowledge?—There is John Henry Walker and Richard Cooke, those are directors, and have signed as I have explained; they have signed by drawing cheques on the company with one hand, and paying them into the company's bankers' with the other. James Disney, the same; — Dakeyne, the same; Thomas Arnold, I know, has not; George Harris has not; John Earle has not, and William Blofield has not.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson*.

12628. [*Handing letter to Witness.*] Is that your writing?—Yes.

12629. Read it to the Committee?—"To Captain St. Leger. Sir, According to my promise of yesterday, to inform you if I should, on going to my house, find myself subpœnaed, I beg to say that I am so, and that I shall be obliged to give my evidence in this Committee on the subscription deed to-morrow."

12630. What date was that?—This was written yesterday; I came to town the day before yesterday. "Should you think it expedient that the other directors of the City of London Railway be informed of this, perhaps you will oblige me by stating thus much to them; in which case should they be desirous to see me on the matter, having been an officer of the company, I shall be for half an hour or so at the Exchequer Coffee-house, where I am attending business on another railway. I am, Sir, your most obedient servant, Charles John Blunt." I should like to observe, that feeling myself called upon, as I understood I was, by one of my clerks, who read a subpœna, for various documents, deeds and books relating to the company, I felt I was in an awkward situation, not having those documents by me, and it struck me by my clerk's observation, that they wanted two certain papers now in possession of the company, which it was prudent to ascertain; with that view I wrote that letter. I promised Captain St. Leger, who is a director, if I was subpœnaed I would inform the board of the fact; I did so, and that is my letter.

12631. You went out of town on Saturday last?—I did.

12632. How?—In a stage coach.

12633. Where from?—From the Swan with Two Necks, Lad-lane.

12634. Where did you go to?—To Coventry.

12635. Where did you go to at Coventry?—I went down to the railway; I am publishing an account of it.

12636. Give me the name of any person you saw at Coventry?—I saw no one there I knew; I put up at a house there, and there I stayed.

12637. What house?—It was on the left-hand side going into the town; I can bring you the bill, if that is any satisfaction to you; however, you will pardon me, I come here under the protection of the Committee. I am ready and willing to offer any evidence touching the subscription deed, but I must decline distinctly (unless I am desired by the Committee to do so), I must decline answering extraneous and irrelevant questions, and I object to answer that question now.

12638. How long did you remain in Coventry?—I remained in Coventry during the whole of Sunday.

12639. At the same place?—Yes.

12640. But you do not know the name of it; and it is on the left-hand side?—Yes.

12641. Did you see any person you knew?—No.

12642. What time did you leave Coventry?—At night.

12643. On Sunday night?—Yes.

12644. By the mail?—I do not know; I left there at 9 o'clock.

12645. Did you book your place?—No; I was not required.

Mr. *C. J. Blunt*,

4 May 1837.

12646. Did you come up inside or outside?—Inside.

12647. What fare did you pay?—1*l.* 2*s.*

12648. Inside or outside?—Inside; 1*l.* 2*s.*

12649. What is the distance from Coventry to London?—Ninety miles, I think.

12650. Did you call on anybody in Coventry?—No.

12651. Had you any business there?—I went on my own business, I stated distinctly; I have stated before it was on the Birmingham railway; it is a subject I am deeply interested in. I must observe to you that this is extraneous and unimportant, and I shall decline answering it, for these questions are not put with any other view than that of irritating a witness.

12652. The *Chairman.*] With regard to any person you called on, or anything that serves to show you went to Coventry, you are bound to answer; we only want to know anything that will serve to show whether you went to Coventry or not. Can you state any person there with whom you had business?—No; I cannot.

12653. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Will you state the subject matter of the business?—I have already stated it.

12654. What was it?—Do not you remember that I went down on the railway, on my own business, to examine the railway? I went to make sketches of the railway.

12655. Did you make any?—I did; I made a sketch of the bridge just before you get into Coventry.

12656. Was anybody in your company?—No.

12657. Did you speak a single word to a soul in Coventry whom you knew?—No; I never was there but three times in my life; one was when I saw Mr. Stephenson there; I went to the same inn; I got there at three o'clock: the second time I went there it rained hard all day, and I never went out of the place.

12658. What sort of carriage did you go down in?—I did not go down in any; I went down to the bridge crossing the road, which I am obliged to cross; it is a stone bridge.

12659. Where is the bridge?—About a mile; I do not know the locality much. To satisfy you of that fact, the company are in possession of a letter written by me from Coventry, and I could state the localities and all the *et ceteras* of Coventry.

12660. You could invent if you like, we know?—You are very civil. I was known to be there by many gentlemen, and by Mr. Good, for he wrote me a letter, which was addressed from Coventry last April.

12661. Did you see any person on your way from your own house or home to the coach which took you to Coventry on Saturday?—No.

12662. Did you stop at the same house you did stop at when you were there before?—Yes.

12663. Should you know the landlord if you were to see him?—No; how should I?

12664. Did you leave any message at your own house when you went away?—Yes.

12665. What was that message?—I left a letter stating where I was gone, which I believe went into several persons' hands; some, my clerks'.

12666. To whom was it addressed?—My wife.

12667. Did not your family know where you were going?—Yes, perfectly.

12668. Why did you send a letter to your wife, then?—A man is not always with his wife; I am engaged in business generally from ten in the morning till ten at night.

12669. We have heard that you are an uncertificated bankrupt; is that so?—I do not see what reference that has to what is before me, and I decline answering the question. I think that when a company become scurrilous, and when they are obliged to attack the character of any individual, (and we find this company has been obliged to attack the character of all,) it does appear to me they have a lame case indeed, when a man's character is brought on the carpet as the only weapon they seem to possess.

12670. I told you that Mr. Hill had asked whether you, who were the engineer of the City Railway, had been an uncertificated bankrupt?—He never asked me; I declare on my honour before the Committee that I never heard a word about it.

12671. Did you leave word at your house that you should not be back for a week?—I believe I did; I can give you my reasons for that.

12672. Do,

12672. Do, if you please?—I would rather not; I could if I wished.

12673. Did you intend to stay a week?—Yes; I came back because I anticipated I should be wanted on this inquiry.

12674. Did you anticipate that before you went?—I did; and I thought I should not be required before I went.

12675. What enabled you to know, between the time of your going and your coming back, that you should be wanted so much earlier?—It struck me, that as the Dover and Deptford had been disposed of, ours would come on next, and I was anxious to be present and give my assistance in the case.

12676. Did you not happen to know that the question before the Dover and Deptford Committee was over before Saturday?—No, I did not; I was not subpœnaed; I am not subpœnaed now.

12677. How did you happen to know it was over; when did you read any account of the Dover and Deptford being over?—I saw it in a paper. My impression was, that, reading the paper with the report, or with certain references to the Westminster and Deptford by the Dover and Deptford Committee, that ours would come on, and I wished to be present. I saw Captain St. Leger, and I stated it was likely I should be subpœnaed. Mr. Green and Mr. Stephens informed me that it was likely I should be subpœnaed.

12678. When did you see them, or either of them?— Last week; the beginning of the week I stated to them I was going out of town.

12679. Have you known Green long?—I have known him by sight perhaps for twelve months.

12680. Are you in the habit of conversing with him?—Not at all.

12681. How did you happen to become acquainted with his person?—From having known him as connected with another railway undertaking.

12682. Where?—In the City of London.

12683. In what railway?—In the Gravesend.

12684. Were you there?—Yes.

12685. What situation did you fill in that?—I was engineer to that.

12686. What was Green?—I do not know; I only know he was there; I only know that. I met him at Rochester, at Gravesend, at Chatham, and so on; that is all; I do not know actually: it is a matter of indifference to me. I do not know the officers of my own company. I see half a dozen men round me belonging to the company, but I cannot tell what offices they hold.

12687. Can you give us the name of any one person with whom you had any word or conversation between London and Coventry, or while you were at Coventry?—No.

12688. Remembering that you are answering with all the solemnity that would be required if you were upon your oath, do you mean now to state to the Committee that you were on Saturday last at Coventry?—Yes, yes, yes, distinctly.

12689. But you cannot tell us the name of any person you saw there, or any one with whom you had any conversation?—My dear sir, I have said so several times.

12690. And you went there to make a drawing?—Yes.

12691. You intended to be away for a week?—I thought it likely. I intended to go away for a week.

12692. Did you not go there for the purpose of avoiding any service of a summons by this Committee?—No. Mr. Bircham will state, and so will Mr. Hill, and so will every one state connected with the Southampton Railway, that I have avoided any interference in this, for or against the company. I have distinctly refused Green and Stephens to have the smallest connexion with them.

12693. Why did you refuse to have any connexion with them?—Why, that being an officer of the railway company, and being a professional man, I thought it would not be a specimen of a man's integrity to go over to the enemy's camp. I thought I had got a sufficient case without lending myself to any other parties whatsoever; and I challenge them to state that fact.

12694. You should not challenge people who have been already examined; it is like challenging a man who will not fight. Did you converse with any Honourable Member of this House on Saturday last in London?—No, I do not think I did. I know several Honourable Members of this House.

12695. Oh, no doubt. Had you got up a petition on your own part to present to the House?—It has been got up more than a week.

Mr. *C. J. Blunt.*

4 May 1837.

12696. How many persons did you offer it to?—One.

12697. Did he accept or refuse it?—He did not refuse it, because I can produce his letter, which is not a refusal of it.

12698. When did you present it to that Honourable Member?—On Friday, if it is material.

12699. Did he send it you back again?—Yesterday; I think, at all events, I received it yesterday.

12700. What did you send it him for?—For presentation.

12701-2. That is what you call not refusing it?—He says, "In consequence of your not having communicated with me in the lobby of the House, I beg to hand you the petition."

12703. What time did you leave London for Coventry on Saturday?—Some time in the evening.

12704. About what time?—I cannot recollect exactly.

12705. What time?—Between eight and nine, I think; I cannot say exactly; I did not know that all this would be required, and I did not make a memorandum of it.

12706. You went from the Swan with Two Necks?—I went out of the city, out of Lad-lane, somewhere.

12707. Was it the Swan with Two Necks?—Upon my life I cannot tell; I went in a cab.

12708. Was it in Lad-lane?—I cannot swear to what is not before me, and what I do not remember distinctly.

12709. Was it in the city?—Yes.

12710. About what part?—Lad-lane, I think; it may be Lad-lane itself.

12711. Is that the nearest you can give us to it?—I think Lad-lane is as near as can be; it is very near there.

12712. You think it is somewhere about there?—Yes.

12713. It might be the Swan with Two Necks, or not?—It might not have been the Golden Cross; if it was the Swan with Two Necks, in Lad-lane, it might be that.

12714. There is a Swan with Two Necks?—There is.

12715. Was it that?—I cannot say.

12716. Where did you get into a cab?—At my own house.

12717. Where did you tell the cabman to drive to?—To Lad-lane.

12718. Then you are sure it was Lad-lane?—Yes, I am sure.

12719. Perhaps you are not quite sure?—Upon my life I cannot say; I know I told him to go there.

12720. Did you tell him where he was to go to in Lad-lane?—I told him to go to the coach-office in Lad-lane; whether it was the Swan with Two Necks, or not, I do not know; I believe there are several such places in Lad-lane.

12721. How long have you been acquainted with London?—Several years; but not with those localities.

12722. Where did you pay your fare?—I paid it there, I believe; I paid it in an office; what I paid, I do not know; for I gave a 5 *l.* note.

12723. Perhaps you can tell the Committee from whom you received it?—I know not, indeed.

12724. Or how long you had had it?—I should say, that a man who is in the habit of receiving money several times a day cannot say who he received a certain 5 *l.* note of, unless he thinks it is a bad one.

12725. Are you sure you paid the money before you started?—Yes.

12726. What name did you give when you booked your place?—I do not know that I gave my name at all; if I did, I gave my own, of course; if I did, I gave my own.

12727. Whether you gave your own you cannot tell?—No.

12728. Did you go outside or inside?—Inside.

12729. Who was inside with you?—How am I to tell that; having got into the coach, perhaps you will let me go quietly to Coventry?

12730. No, I will not; was there one, or more than one, besides?—There was not six.

12731. Was there one, or more than one?—There was one or two, I believe, besides.

12732. Men or women?—Men, I believe.

12733. Any

12733. Any women?—No.

12734. Are you quite sure there were no women?—I said men; I answered your question, you know.

12735. What time did the coach get to Coventry?—That I do not know; I was asleep, and went to bed as soon as I got in.

12736. About what time did you get in?—In the morning.

12737. Yes, yes, you did not go there till night; you could not get there till the morning; but about what time?—I should think between five and six; perhaps seven o'clock; I cannot say to an hour.

12738. Had you taken any clothing; such as, for instance, a cap, which sometimes people travel with to avoid the inconvenience of a hat?—No.

12739. Did you sleep in your hat or out of it?—What an absurd question to ask! I believe I may have done both.

12740. Do you remember to have put your hat up inside the coach?—I do not.

12741. Perhaps you did not state you did so?—I said I might have done so.

12742. Did you or not?—I cannot say.

12743. Was the coach full?—Some part of the way it was, and some part not.

12744. Was it full from London?—No.

12745. How many persons did you start with from London?—I think two; I am not sure.

12746. Might there have been three?—I should say not.

12747. Then you do not know whether there was one or two?—No.

12748. Or whether they were men or women?—I stated my impression was, that they were men, of course.

12749. Will you undertake to say they were not women?—I said my impression is, they were not.

12750. What place did you change horses at first?—That I cannot tell.

12751. Tell me any place where you recollect to have changed horses on the journey?—I believe we changed horses at Dunstable the first place.

12752. Were you awake then?—Yes.

12753. Who did you ask?—A passenger, an outside passenger.

12754. Was that when you got out of the coach?—Yes.

12755. Did you take anything?—No.

12756. Was it a man or a woman?—A man.

12757. Will you say it was a man?—Yes.

12758. Not a woman?—No; I do not talk to women outside coaches.

12759. What time was that?—In the middle of the night, sometime or other.

12760. Now attend to this question. Upon the honour which you have made such boast of, upon your honour as an officer of a company, have you not stated to this Committee, in the hearing of the Honourable Members around you, that you went down to Coventry on the outside?—No.

12761. You have been making observations from a paper from time to time; have you any objection to show it to me?—Yes, decidedly.

12762. You came up to London the day before yesterday?—Yes.

12763. What time of the day did you arrive?—In the morning, eight or nine o'clock.

12764. Where did you come to?—To the Angel at Islington.

12765. By a night coach?—Yes.

12766. Did any one meet you there?—No.

12767. On Tuesday morning?—Yes.

12768. What time did you leave Coventry?—At night.

12769. What night?—The night before, of course.

12770. Monday night or Sunday night?—Sunday night.

12771. Are you sure of that?—Yes.

12772. What time did you leave Coventry on Sunday night?—About nine, I think, or half-past nine.

12773. What time in the day did you take the drawing?—In the morning.

12774. Before or after church?—Both before, after, and during church.

12775. And on the night of that day you left Coventry for London?—Yes.

12776. And you arrived in town on Tuesday morning at nine o'clock?—No.

12777. Be so good as to explain to the Committee how, after leaving Coventry

Mr. *C. J. Blunt.*

4 May 1837.

at nine o'clock on Sunday evening, you found your way to the Angel at Islington on Tuesday?—I did not say I did.

12778. Did you not say that you came to London the day before yesterday; you said Tuesday; do you mean to deny that?—I cannot recollect that.

12779. Did you come to town on Monday or Tuesday?—I came to town on Monday.

12780. Have you not three times in the course of this examination said, that you came to town the day before yesterday?—I meant with reference to that, that I was in town on the business of the company.

12781. When you said you came to town on Tuesday, you meant that as you live in the country you did not come to London till Tuesday?—I did not.

12782. Upon your honour, were you not in the Old Jewry on Monday?—No; if I was in the Old Jewry on Monday, it was without my recollection; I do not remember it.

12783. Were you there or not?—I would not swear that I was there or not.

12784. Does your tailor live there?—Decidedly.

12785. Did you go there on Monday to order clothes, or for any other purpose?—It is very likely I did.

12786. Were you in London the greater part of Monday?—No.

12787. How much?—The latter part of the day.

12788. How long?—From one to three or four o'clock.

12789. Was any one with you?—Yes.

12790. Who?—A lady.

12791. Have you any objection to name her?—Yes; because I think the inquiry is impertinent.

12792. Where did you meet the lady?—In any other place, I should say, "What is that to you?" I should say it is a very impertinent question. If I may be allowed to state, I am informed distinctly that it is the intention of counsel not to confine himself to the elucidation of the real evidence, so much as to badger and ill use the witnesses.

12793. Who told you that?—That is a piece of information I shall reserve for another place.

12794. The *Chairman.*] You are bound to give an answer to such questions as tend to show whether you are speaking truth or not.

12795. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You state a lady was with you; tell me where you met with her?—I shall decline answering the question.

12796. Where did you part with her?—I shall decline answering the question.

12797. Where did you go with her besides the tailor's?—I shall decline answering the question.

12798. Where did you sleep on Monday night?—I shall decline answering the question.

12799. Where on Tuesday night?—I shall decline answering that.

12800. Where did you sleep last night?—I shall decline answering that question also.

12801. Where do you live?—At No. 85, Fleet-street.

12802. Did you sleep there on Monday night?—I shall decline answering that question.

12803. Do you live anywhere else?—Yes, at home.

12804. Where is that?—I shall decline answering that.

12805. The *Chairman.*] Where do you live?—I generally live at an hotel in London.

12806. Mr. *Clarkson.*] For how long together have you lived at an hotel?—Sometimes two or three months; for the last three months I have been living at an hotel.

12807. Which is the last hotel?—The Craven.

12808. Did you sleep there on Monday night?—No.

12809. Tuesday night?—No.

12810. Wednesday night?—No.

12811. Where did you sleep on either of those nights?—I shall not answer the question.

12812. Have you any other domicile except the hotel, and the house in Fleet-street?—No; I live with friends in the country.

12813. Where

12813. Where is your domicile in the country?—I shall claim the protection of the Committee; this question is put to me for a sinister object by certain parties, of whom you have the effrontery to become the instrument.

12814. The *Chairman.*] Do you object to state where you reside, because you are in difficulties; is that so?—I shall object to give it up, unless forced by this Committee to do so, for it is a daring attempt on the part of the company to frighten me into acquiescence: there is my house of business, and where I am to be seen daily from morning till night, at 85, Fleet-street.

12815. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Where you are daily to be found?—I must claim the protection of this honourable Committee from being exposed to an exhibition of malevolent feeling, and that of the very worst kind too, on the part of those by whom I have sustained a loss which I can very ill afford. I do not hesitate to say where I am professionally to be found. I was not required to be here; they have not subpœnaed me; the favour of the Chairman was left at my house, and I obeyed it as soon as I could; and I am here without the subpœna being served upon me, and without a knowledge of its contents.

12816. Where are you to be found professionally when called on?—At 85, Fleet-street.

12817. Were you there on Monday?—Yes, in the afternoon.

12818. What part of the day did you come there?—I came there at divers parts of the day.

12819. At what part of the day did you come there the first time?—In the afternoon, on my return from the Old Jewry.

12820. Where did you go to when you arrived at the Angel at Islington?—To my house in the country; the house I decline giving you a reference to, for I consider this a very worthless attempt on the part of the company, who have the effrontery to sit there and try to bring me into trouble. I do not hesitate to tell you that if I am sacrificed in this undertaking, it shall not be without diligently exposing the transactions of the company.

12821. Does the Grecian Hotel sometimes have the honour to entertain you?—Yes, till within the last three months.

12822. For three months together?—Yes, till within the last three months; within the last four months.

12823. Till within the last four months you had been living regularly, that is from day to day, for three months, at the Grecian Hotel?—Yes, because I expected then to give my evidence in Parliament, and was in attendance to give my evidence before Committees, which were attempted to be proceeded with. I came to town on purpose, and lived at the hotel, in order to give my evidence.

12824. Have you any servants in Fleet-street, the house of business?—I have clerks.

12825. What was the latest time you were there on Saturday?—I do not think I was there on Saturday at all.

12826. What was the earliest time you were there on Monday?—In the afternoon.

12827. Did you see anybody on the outside of the committee-room, before you came to the inside?—Yes.

12828. Were you asked by any one to come in?—Yes.

12829. Did you refuse to come in?—No.

12830. Are you quite sure about that?—Yes.

12831. Then you never refused to come in at the solicitation of any one?—No; I did not come in, because, being a witness, I thought the witnesses were turned out as soon as they came in.

12832. Did you refuse to come in?—No.

12833. Did you say anything to anybody that you would not come in?—No.

12834. You are quite sure you never said to any one you would not come in, or anything to that effect?—Nothing to that effect.

12835. Your are quite sure of that?—Yes; it was a matter of perfect indifference to me whether I came in or not.

12836. What did you come here for?—To be called as evidence.

12837. When did you first hear there was a summons for you?—The day before yesterday.

Mr. *C. J. Blunt.*

4 May 1837.

12838. Who told you?—I found it by reference to my father, brother and so on; my brother has got it; my clerk told me that such a matter had been left.

12839. Which clerk; what is his name?—Crews.

12840. Is he the man that told you?—He said there were papers left in the hands of my brother and father.

12841. When did he tell you that?—The day before yesterday.

12842. Are you quite sure he did not tell you so on Monday?—Yes.

12843. When you were at your office on Monday, were you not told that persons had been to inquire for you there on that very day?—No, for I took my letters away, and did not wait a moment; I had this lady with me, and I went away immediately; I had no business to do there on Monday at all; I took my papers and went away; I saw no paper, and heard of no calls. You speak of Monday, I believe?

12844. Yes. You say you changed a 5 *l.* note at the inn?—Yes.

12845. What change did you get?—£. 2 or 3 *l.* and some silver; I cannot say exactly; I could tell by reference to the money I have spent.

12846. It is very easy to learn what the fare is to Coventry, no doubt?—I am not in the habit of getting up evidence, that is not my profession; I do not manufacture falsehoods; some people live by it.

12847. Who was inside the coach?—Strangers to me.

12848. How many?—Three or four.

12849. Can you tell the Committee?—No.

12850. How many were there when you got in?—Two, I think.

12851. Which, two or three?—Two.

12852. Are you sure of that?—Yes.

12853. When you got into the inn?—The coach office,

12854. Whereabouts is the coach office?—Nearly opposite the inn; I do not know the name of the street.

12855. What is the sign of the inn you were at?—I do not remember, I have already told you, although I have been there three times; I addressed letters to the company from this very inn.

12856. That you said, a long time ago, in April last; if you addressed letters from there, surely you can tell the name of the inn?—I cannot say.

12857. Can you tell me the colour of the coach you went by?—No; I do not recollect; the letter I wrote from Coventry to the board was written anticipating that I should remain there two or three days, but I came up by the night coach, or by the mail.

12858. Did you write it in London or in the country?—In the country, at Coventry.

12859. Did you send it by post?—Yes, and afterwards came to town by the night coach.

12860. Did you not a short time ago tell the Committee that you left a letter before you went for your wife?—I am speaking of a letter addressed to this company last April. When you were speaking of last April, I told you that I could not recollect the name of the inn, though it is written on that letter, which letter is written from the inn, from which I came up by the night coach.

12861. Did you go to the tailor's in the Old Jewry for the purpose of ordering clothes there?—It is very likely I did.

12862. Did you, or did you not?—I believe I did.

12863. Are you certain?—I rather think it was not to order clothes.

12864. Was it to inquire if they were ready?—Yes, perhaps, and to complain of things I did not like.

12865. Are they the clothes you are wearing now?—I shall not answer the question.

12866. Then I shall take it for granted they are?—You may do as you like, but you must remember this, that a man owes a duty to himself and to the public when he is under cross-examination by any counsel. The duty to myself I maintain.

12867. Will you tell me where the clothes were sent?—To Fleet-street, I believe.

12868. Were they?—Yes.

12869. When did they come?—I do not know that.

12870. When did you first see them?—Last night.

12871. Have you any objection to tell me the name of the tailor?—Brasher, I believe. I think it is very irrelevant. I have admitted going there.

12872. Had you any other conversation with him except about clothes?—No.

12873. Where had you been to on Monday before you went to him?—I do not remember exactly.

12874. How long had you been in London before you got to him?—About half an hour, perhaps.

12875. Did you come by coach, or did you walk?—I walked.

12876. How far from London do you live?—About three miles.

12877. Had you slept there the night before you called at the tailor's?—It is very likely I did.

12878. Just endeavour to recollect?—I rather decline answering that question. I know what the question leads to, and therefore I decline answering it.

12879. Did you sleep at your house in the country; I do not care if it was three, five or twenty miles off; did you sleep at your house in the country the night before you went to the tailor's?—For obvious reasons, I decline answering that question; it would be better that I should not answer it. I decline answering that question.

12880. Are there servants in that house?—You are not likely to know it; I would answer it, if I considered it relevant to the subject.

12881. Do you breakfast at that house in the country before you come to town?—I do not always breakfast at the same time.

12882. About what time?—Nine or ten; I cannot say.

12883. Perhaps not later than ten?—Perhaps not.

12884. Was it earlier than ten?—I should think not; I cannot say exactly; I say between nine and ten; that is my answer.

12885. I think you say you walked to London?—Yes.

12886. Did you meet any one you knew on the road?—No.

12887. Did you at any time give to the directors of the company a receipt in full of all demands?—Yes.

12888. Did you ever give them a receipt?—Yes.

12889. When was the last?—On the 8th of February.

12890. For how much?—£. 150.

12891. Was there one after that?—Yes, for 300 *l.*, that cannot be called a receipt; I lent the company a receipt for 300 *l.* to cover some shares.

12892. But you never gave them a receipt in full of all demands?—No, never.

12893. Did you ever take any papers from the office?—Never, except my own.

12894. Did you ever take any receipt from the office?—Never.

12895. Or any paper with a receipt stamp or writing upon it?—Never.

12896. Nor do you know what has become of it?—No.

12897. Have you seen an advertisement, advertising for the loss of it?—I have.

12898. When did you first see that?—Two days following my advertisement in the paper announcing my retirement from the company. It was put in in consequence of my retirement.

12899. Two days after your retirement?—No, two days after the advertisement appeared; that advertisement appeared on the 21st, and mine on the 18th.

12900. When did you finally retire?—On the 18th of March.

12901. You had nothing to do with the company after that?—Yes, as far as related to my evidence, but not as an officer.

Jovis, 11° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. Warburton.
Mr. Forster.	

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., in the Chair.

Mr. *Francis Beetham*, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. *F. Beetham.* 11 May 1837.

16574. *Chairman.*] WHAT is this book?—The Parliamentary Committee Book of the City Railway.

16575. Who kept this book?—Mr. Gethen.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Gethen*, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. *W. Gethen.*

16576. IS there any entry in this book of a negotiation which there was between the committee or Mr. Dakeyne on the one hand, and Mr. Charles John Blunt or Mr. Laxton on the other hand, on the subject of their receiving shares instead of money as payment for their services?—Not to my knowledge.

16577. There is no such entry in that minute-book?—No.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *H. C. Dakeyne*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *H. C. Dakeyne.*

16578. *Chairman.*] DID you write this letter [*handing one to the Witness*], dated "City and Richmond Railway Office, Exchequer Coffee-house, 16th March 1837," addressed to "Charles John Blunt, esq.," and signed "H. C. Dakeyne"?—Yes, I did; or I signed it.

16579. You signed that letter, the body of it being written by another person. With the exception of the christian name of Mr. Blunt, you approved of that letter?—Yes.

16580-81 The letter is, "The 150 shares, deposited by Mr. Charles Fly Blunt with me, are to be given to your nomination, after the passing of the Act of Parliament; and the receipt given by you for 300*l.* this day to the directors on account shall be considered as payment on account of professional charges incurred by you on behalf of the Company, after the passing of the Act of Incorporation of the City of London Railway Company, and the deposits on the 150 shares, signed for by Mr. Charles Fly Blunt, considered as paid;" just explain what was the nature of this transaction in which it is stated that the deposits on 150 shares, signed for by Charles Fly Blunt, shall be considered as paid. Were the deposits paid upon those 150 shares?—They were paid by the company.

16582. In what way were they paid; did they pay the sum of 300*l.* into the bankers'?—Yes.

16583. On account of those shares?—Yes.

16584. Does a payment appear in your bankers' book to the amount of 300*l.* on account of those 150 shares?—Yes, there does.—(Mr. *Gethen.*) And I have a receipt for the money from Mr. Blunt.

16585. Explain the nature of the transaction to which this passage alludes, "And the deposits on 150 shares, signed by Charles Fly Blunt, considered as paid;" just explain the nature of that transaction?—The money, I understand——

16586. Do not tell us what you understand, but what you know?—That Charles John Blunt was paid 300*l.*, for which he gave me a receipt,* and that was the

* Copy of the Receipt:

March 15, 1837.—Received, of the Directors of the City of London Railway Company, the sum of Three hundred pounds, on account of professional charges.

£. 300 – – *Charles John Blunt.*

the money which was paid into the bankers' on account of certain parties signing for him, to the amount of 150 shares; I gave the shares to him for this purpose after the money was paid in.

16587. The company, in the first instance, paid Charles John Blunt 300 *l.* in money on account of his services; then Charles John Blunt handed back the money which was paid into the banker's hands as the deposit on account of the 150 shares that were handed to him?—Exactly so.

16588. Did any discussion take place on the 14th March 1837, before either the board of directors or the provisional committee, on the subject of the propriety of the officers giving receipts to the company for money, it being understood that they should not receive money but shares as payment?—(Mr. *Laxton.*) The conversation with myself was this: I offered to take 150 more shares of the company, and pay the deposit of 300 *l.* on them.

16589. Did that proposal come from you, or from the directors?—From me.

16590. Were you present when the discussion took place with Charles John Blunt upon the subject of his taking shares?—I was not, except that he offered to take 150 shares.

16591. Did he object to it?—No, he made no objection.

16592. You were present at the time?—Yes.

16593. Your number of shares was 302?—It was 151 previously, and 151 subsequently.

16594. Was it then understood you were to take your shares, and that the directors were to pay the deposit for you?—No, it was not.

16595. What was the understanding?—I voluntarily offered to take the 150 shares, and *bonâ fide* pay the deposits out of the money due to me from the company.

16596. Did they draw a draft, or pay you cash to the amount of 302 *l.*?—They gave me a draft at that time for 302 *l.* on account of my professional services.

16597. A separate draft for that amount?—Yes.

16598. And that 302 *l.* you paid into the bank as a deposit upon half that number of shares?—Yes, I did.

16599. How does that entry appear upon the accounts of the company at that time?—There is a balance still due to me from the company.

Mr. *Beetham.*] Here is the entry [*producing the bankers' book*]; here are Mr. Blunt's shares. It appeared in the bankers' book, under the date of the 15th of March 1837, that on account of Charles Fly Blunt there was paid in 76 *l.*; ditto, 124 *l.*; ditto, 100 *l.*; making together 300 *l.*; and on account of Mr. Laxton's shares there was paid in, by Blofield, 72 *l.*; Holland, 60 *l.*; Mills, 50 *l.*; Arnold, 60 *l.*; and Miller, 60 *l.*

16600. Have you disposed of those shares, as I see the sums are paid upon by other parties, and not by yourself?—(Mr. *Laxton.*) Those are the parties who signed the deed for me.

16601. Which, in your evidence, you mention as having signed the deed for you?—Yes, excepting Mills; he does not appear in the subscription deed.

16602. Did Charles John Blunt give the directors any receipt on the date of the 15th of March?—(Mr. *Gethen.*) The 14th of March.

16603. On either of those dates?—Yes.

16604. Can you produce the receipt?—Yes, I can produce it.

16605. Produce any receipt or letter relating to this settlement of account on or about the 14th or 15th of March?—(Mr. *Gethen.*) I will.

16606. Did you have any letter similar to this from the directors?—(Mr. *Laxton.*) I had not.

16607. Have you any document similar to this in your possession?—No.

16608. Did you give any receipt?—Yes, I did.

16609. You will produce that also?—(Mr. *Gethen.*) Very well.

APPENDIX.

CITY OR SOUTHWARK AND HAMMERSMITH BRIDGE RAILWAY.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

CITY, OR SOUTHWARK AND HAMMERSMITH RAILWAY.

No. 1.—Petition of Richard Lill against Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Bill; 16 March 1837 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 143

No. 2.—Petition of the Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company; 17 March 1837 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 145

No. 3.—Petition of the Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company 20 March 1837 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 146

No. 4.—Petition of W. Robinson Chamberlain, and William Algernon Lens Piercy; 20 March 1837 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 146

No. 5.—Petition of Joseph Dandridge against the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway; 20 March 1837 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 147

No. 6.—Petition of Richard Lill; 21 March 1837 - - - - - - - - p. 148

No. 7.—Petition of F. T. Bircham and Clement Francis; 4 April 1837 - - - p. 148

No. 8.—Petition of the London and Southampton Railway Company; 4 April 1837 - p. 150

No. 9.—Petition of the Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company; 4 April 1837 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 151

No. 10.—Petition of Henry Luard; 6 April 1837 - - - - - - - - p. 152

No. 11.—Petition of C. J. Blunt; 4 May 1837 - - - - - - - - - p. 153

No. 12.—Copy of Parliamentary Contract of the City or Southwark and Hammersmith Railway - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 154

No. 13.—Copy of Subscribers' Agreement - - - - - - - - - p. 155

No. 14.—List of Subscribers - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 156

No. 15.—Return from the Directors of the City of London, or Southwark and Hammersmith Railway, of the Number of Applicants for Shares, Number of Shares applied for, and Number of Shares allotted - - - - - - - - - - - p. 164

No. 16.—Affidavit of Mr. Charles Ball - - - - - - - - - - p. 165

APPENDIX.

CITY, OR SOUTHWARK AND HAMMERSMITH BRIDGE RAILWAY.

Appendix, No. 1.

PETITION of *Richard Lill.*—16th March 1837.

CITY RAILWAY.

Appendix, No. 1. Petition of R. Lill.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Richard Lill*, of Vauxhall, in the county of Surrey, Grocer,

Showeth,

THAT a Bill has been introduced into your Honourable House, intituled, "A Bill for making and maintaining a Railway from the south end of Southwark Bridge, to join other Railways at or near the south and west parts of the Metropolis."

That, from the prospectus and advertisements issued and published by the promoters of the said Bill, it appears that they originally intended to construct a railway to Richmond, in addition to the line of railway now contemplated; and that the company formed for the purpose was then called the City of London and Richmond Company, and the capital was stated to be one million.

That the said company lately abandoned their intention of making a railway to Richmond, and limited their measures to the formation of a line from Southwark to Hammersmith.

That your petitioner is an owner of property upon and near the line of the said railway, and will be greatly aggrieved by the construction thereof, and would be still more injured should the promoters of the said undertaking be permitted to obtain their Act, and then be compelled, either from the inadequacy of their estimate, or the irresponsibility of the subscribers, or other cause, to abandon their project.

That your petitioner cannot fail to be prejudiced even if such abandonment preceded the commencement of the works, by the uncertainty to which he would be subjected, and the consequent inability to dispose of, or deal with his property, and, if such abandonment should be made after the works were in part constructed, the whole neighbourhood must be greatly disfigured, irreparable mischief inflicted on the owners of property therein, and all future improvements of their estates rendered hopeless.

That your petitioner has for these, and the like reasons, particularly directed his attention to the list of subscribers deposited by the promoters of the said Bill in the Private Bill Office of this Honourable House, and has found that even for the limited objects now contemplated by the promoters of this scheme, scarcely more than half of the capital is subscribed for; that is to say, the amount of such capital being 850,000 *l.*, your petitioner finds that the subscription amounts to 437,550 *l.*, being 12,550 *l.* only more than half of the entire capital.

That your petitioner has been informed and believes, that until very recently the subscription was much below a moiety of the capital, but that the promoters, in order to enable them to comply with the Standing Orders of this Honourable House, very little previous to the presentation of their petition for leave to bring in the said Bill, obtained many persons, whose signatures appear last in the said deposited copy of the deed of contract, to subscribe for sums far beyond the means of such subscribers to pay; and (as your petitioner believes, it would appear, if such persons, or the principal parties concerned in procuring such subscription, were examined before a Committee of your Honourable House) upon terms amounting to an evasion of the spirit of the Standing Orders of your Honourable House, as well as a deception of the other subscribers to the said undertaking, and the public at large.

That amongst the subscribers to the said undertaking appear the names of many needy persons, who, as your petitioner has been informed and believes, are totally and notoriously unable to meet their liabilities under the said subscription deed, and some of whom, at least, were induced to subscribe their names thereto as the creatures of others, who, being unwilling to incur the responsibility of executing the deed themselves, procured such needy individuals to do so on consideration of a small commission.

That your petitioner humbly calls the attention of your Honourable House to the following cases, which your petitioner has been informed, and believes, are only a small proportion of those which, if time be allowed, and a full investigation ordered, will be found to have signed the said contract deed under such improper circumstances:

				£.	
Jacob N. Castello	11, Beaumont-street, Mile End.	share agent, signed three times.	75 shares	3,750	- - signed the Kent Railway Company's contract deed for many shares, and induced thirty-three other persons, who possessed no interest therein, to sign the same for a small sum paid for each signature.

				£.	
Charles Fraser -	3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road.	share agent, signed twice.	30 shares	1,500	- - signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway Company's contract deed for forty shares, or 2,000 *l.*, under the circumstances mentioned in the petition of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, presented to this Honourable House on the 9th of March instant.
John Morgan -	13, Yardley-street, Clerkenwell.	gentleman, signed twice.	30 shares	1,500	- - signed the said Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway Company's deed once, for 15 shares, or 750 *l.*, as John Henry Morgan, his name being Henry Morgan, under the same circumstances as are before referred to.
William Algernon Lens Piercy.	16, Elder-street, Norton Folgate.	gentleman, signed twice.	50 shares	2,500	- - signed the said Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway Company's deed for ten shares, or 500 *l.*, as William Algernon Piercy, under the same circumstances.
William R. Chamberlain.	21, Surrey Grove, Kent-road.	agent - -	10 shares	500	- - signed the said Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway Company's deed twice, for twenty-five shares, or 1,250 *l.*, under the same circumstances.
William Dorrington.	Auction Mart Coffee House.	ditto - -	60 shares	3,000	- - signed the said Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway Company's deed for sixty shares, or 3,000 *l.* (being there described as of Harleyford-street, Vauxhall, his proper address), under the before-mentioned circumstances.
J. Dandridge -	102, Wood-street	gentleman -	135 shares	7,750	
Henry Gunson -	Adam's-court, Broad-street.	gentleman, signed twice.	70 shares	3,500	
John Jackson -	41, Dorset Crescent, New North Road.	gentleman -	100 shares	5,000	- - signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway contract, for sixty shares, or 3,000 *l.*
William Burnett Bloxam, signs first as William Bloxam, and a second time as William Burnett.	Described first Morden Cottage, Surrey.	stockbroker	35 shares	2,500	
	Park-street -	gentleman -	15 shares		

That your petitioner is informed, and believes, that several others of the subscribers to the said undertaking are persons of insufficient means, and that several of them have been bankrupts, or have taken the benefit of the Act for the relief of insolvent debtors; but your petitioner, for obvious reasons, declines stating the names of such parties upon the face of this petition.

That the facts hereinbefore mentioned did not come to the knowledge of your petitioner till very recently, and not till after the second reading of the said Bill.

That your petitioner submits that these facts call for the serious consideration and investigation of your Honourable House, and he confidently relies that inasmuch as the parties concerned in the matters aforesaid are guilty of a great breach of the privileges of your Honourable House, as well as a deception of the public and the *bonâ fide* subscribers to the said undertaking, your Honourable House will be pleased to give every possible facility to the investigation of the case, with a view as well to the protection of your petitioner and other parties interested, as to a proper assertion of the dignity of your Honourable House.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays your Honourable House, that the said Bill may not be allowed to pass into a law as it now stands, and that the matters aforesaid may be referred to a Select Committee to be appointed, with all proper powers for the investigation thereof, or that the Committee to whom the said Bill stands referred, may be instructed, without delay, to investigate the same, as a preliminary inquiry, and with a view to save your petitioner and the other parties the expense of previously appearing before the said Committee on other grounds of opposition to the said Bill; and that

your

your petitioner may be heard by himself, his counsel, agents and witnesses, upon the matters aforesaid, and such parts and clauses of the said Bill as are against his interest; and that your Honourable House will take such other measures for the protection and relief of your petitioner as to your Honourable House may seem meet.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 2.

PETITION of the Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company.—17 March 1837.

Appendix, No. 2. Petition of the Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Henry Charles Dakeyne*, of St. John's Wood, *John Henry Walker*, of Charlotte-street, Bedford-square, *James C. Disney*, of Belmont Lodge, Nine Elms, *Richard Cooke*, of Kentish Town, *John St. Leger*, of 22, Baker-street, *Frederick Polhill*, Esquire, a Member of your Honourable House, and *Hans Busk*, of Great Cumberland-place, Hyde Park, being Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company,

Showeth,

That a petition has been presented to your Honourable House from an individual describing himself as Richard Lill, of Vauxhall, in the county of Surrey, grocer, containing certain allegations as to the conduct of your petitioners, to which your petitioners desire to reply *seriatim*.

First. Your petitioners acknowledge that it was originally intended to construct a railway to Richmond as alleged; but it being represented to your petitioners that such railway would meet with considerable opposition from some of the landowners on the line; that there were no such powerful reasons in its favour as those which called for an union between the Great Trunk Railways of the West of England, of London and Birmingham, and of London and Southampton, with the heart of the city of London and the banks of the Thames, near the centre of business, which the said railway, without going to Richmond, would effect at once, deferred to the opposition of those whose wishes ought ever to be consulted, and in the spirit of the Standing Order of your Honourable House, and the protective intentions of the Legislature, immediately relinquished the intention of attempting to carry the line a single step beyond the wishes of at least four-fifths of the owners, lessees and occupiers who might be affected thereby.

Secondly. That the next allegation of the said petitioner Richard Lill, that he would be greatly injured if your petitioners abandon their said undertaking, either in the whole or in part, rests upon a supposition that applies to all railways, but to your petitioners' line least of any, inasmuch as they are promised, in case of the Legislature granting to them their Bill, the co-operation of certain great undertakings which are already completed, and the profits of which your petitioners' railway would immensely enhance.

Thirdly. That the next allegation, that only 12,550 *l.* more than half the capital is subscribed for in the list of subscribers deposited by the promoters of the said Bill in the Private Bill Office of your Honourable House, is true; but the reason for which is, that your petitioners did not conceive it to be necessary to act beyond the Standing Orders of your Honourable House, which requires only one half to be subscribed in this stage of their Bill, though in point of fact they had then received deposits upon shares to the amount of 30,000 *l.* in addition to the sum of 437,550 *l.* therein accounted for.

Fourthly. That the allegation of the said petitioner, that, until recently, less than a moiety of the capital was subscribed, and that the promoters of the said Bill obtained many persons whose signatures appear last in the deposited copy of the deed of contract to sign the same, is altogether false and unfounded.

Fifthly. That your petitioners indignantly disclaim that they or any of them induced any person or persons to sign the deed of contract, who to their knowledge was or were unable to meet his or their liabilities, and that no person or persons was or were allowed to sign the same, who had not then, or previously, paid the deposits on the shares for which he or they severally subscribed.

Sixthly. That as to the allegation of the ten individuals who are stated to have subscribed their names for certain shares in the said railway, and under similar circumstances, in certain other railways, your petitioners humbly represent that these persons were early subscribers, and not among the last; and that there is no Report at present from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the allegations as to such other railways, and that, consequently, your Honourable House can know nothing of the truth or falsehood of such statements, still less your petitioners; and that it would be a most grievous hardship upon your petitioners, if, in the hundreds of names of persons taking shares in the said railway, they were to be called upon to exercise an inquisitorial power of searching into the circumstances of every individual.

Seventhly. Your petitioners most solemnly affirm, and are ready to make oath, that not one farthing of the funds belonging to the said company has been given to any person or persons to induce him or them to subscribe his or their names to such list of subscribers or deed of contract; but your petitioners verily believe that the said Richard Lill in insinuating such charges is instigated by certain other parties who have an interest in other lines

lines of railway, which your petitioners' line might be supposed to interfere with, or supersede, and who dare not come forward and make the same charges in their own proper persons, but who prefer doing so by indigent and irresponsible tools.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray, that the allegations contained in the petition of the said Richard Lill may be inquired into, as prayed by him, by the Committee on the said Bill, or by any other Committee deemed expedient by your Honourable House, and that such Committee be directed to report on the truth or falsehood of the same to your Honourable House.

And your petitioners shall ever pray.

Appendix, No. 3.

PETITION of the Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company.—20th March 1837.

Appendix, No. 3. Petition of the Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company,

Showeth,

That your petitioners presented an humble petition to your Honourable House on Friday evening last, denying and calling for inquiries into certain allegations made in a petition presented to your Honourable House by one Richard Lill, of Vauxhall, grocer, on the evening before.

That your petitioners have since been informed, and they believe, that the said Richard Lill was induced to make and present the same petition by the directors or promoters of a certain company called the Southampton Railway Company.

That your petitioners have had some negotiations with the said Southampton Railway Company as to a mutual arrangement for using the lines of the two companies by each other, but your petitioners terminated such negotiations because they considered that the terms claimed by the Southampton Railway were unreasonable, exorbitant and unjust.

That the solicitor to the said Southampton Railway Company has admitted to several persons that he knew of and had perused and settled the petition of the said Richard Lill.

That although your petitioners' subscription list has been lodged for upwards of fourteen days in the Private Bill Office before your petitioners went into Committee on the Bill, still no petition was presented by the said Richard Lill against the said company until the very day your petitioners were going into Committee, when the counsel professedly acting on behalf of the said Richard Lill, or those persons whom he represents, made application to the Committee, and obtained a postponement on the ground that a motion would be made to your Honourable House on Friday last for a Committee to inquire into the allegations of the said petition, but no such notice was made, thereby putting your petitioners to unnecessary expense and delay.

That under such circumstances, your petitioners humbly suggest to your Honourable House that they and the company they represent will be put to delay, expense and inconvenience, by having their proceedings suspended, not because the said Richard Lill may suffer any injury from the acts of your petitioners, or from the said railway being abandoned or carried on, but because your petitioners will not consent to the exorbitant and unjust terms sought to be imposed upon them by the said Southampton Railway Company.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray, in the event of your Honourable House entertaining the prayer of the petition of the said Richard Lill, that the said Richard Lill be compelled to proceed instantly to the proof of the allegations in his said petition; and that the Committee of your Honourable House, to whom the said petition and the former petition of your petitioners may be referred, may be instructed to inquire and report whether the expenses of the said Richard Lill are not borne by the said Southampton Company, or any other parties; and whether, in case the allegations in his said petition are found to be false, or frivolous and vexatious, he, or the said Southampton Railway Company, or such other parties, should not be bound to pay the costs incurred by your petitioners in replying to and disproving the allegations of the said petition.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 4.

PETITION of *W. Robinson Chamberlain*, and *W. Algernon Lens Piercy*.—20 March 1837.

Appendix, No. 4. Petition of W. R. Chamberlain, and W. A. L. Piercy.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Wm. Robinson Chamberlain*, of No. 21, Surrey Grove, Old Kent Road, and *William Algernon Lens Piercy*, of No. 16, Elder-street, Norton Folgate, Gentleman,

Showeth,

That your petitioners have seen the petition of Richard Lill, of Vauxhall, in the county of Surrey, grocer, presented to this Honourable House on the 16th instant, and presented by order

of this Honourable House, in which petition it is stated that your petitioners are unable to meet their liabilities, and were induced to subscribe their names as creatures of others, for the purpose of avoiding any responsibility to their employers, and praying an investigation into the matter.

That your petitioners admit they have signed the subscription deed, but not in the manner alleged by the said Richard Lill, but in the ordinary and usual way, having first paid their deposits into the banking-house of the company, from which they received receipts prior to your petitioners obtaining their shares from the directors, as hereinafter mentioned.

That in the month of March or April 1836, your petitioners having seen the prospectus of the City of London Railway Company advertised, and considering it a most beneficial measure to the public for bringing the goods and passengers from the Great Western and other railway terminuses to the heart of the city, and that it was a fair speculation, made application by letters to the directors for twenty shares each, to which application the secretary wrote to your petitioners, stating that the directors allotted to each of them only ten shares instead of twenty, as applied for.

That your petitioner, William Algernon Lens Piercy, became possessed of forty additional shares in the said company by purchase, not from the directors, but in the stocks market in the ordinary way, for which he paid his money, conceiving it then, as now, a good speculation and investment.

That your petitioners say they are unacquainted with Richard Lill, but have been informed he keeps a chandler's shop at Vauxhall, and believe that the allegation made against your petitioners by him is not from any knowledge of your petitioners or their circumstances, but for some interested and improper motive; and your petitioners, in the most unqualified manner, deny all and every of his allegations as to their solvency, character and reputation, and are ready to be examined at the bar of this Honourable House, as to the correctness of their statements, in repelling so foul a calumny on their honour, character and credit.

That your petitioners are persons in business, and heretofore of unblemished reputation amongst their neighbours and friends, and feel that their characters are deeply involved in this charge of the said Richard Lill, so presented to this Honourable House by his petition of the 16th instant.

They therefore humbly pray, that if an inquiry is instituted by this Honourable House as to the truth or falsehood of the allegations against your petitioners, that the said Richard Lill may be ordered to give security to abide the costs of the event of such inquiry into the truth or falsehood of such allegations, and will afford such other relief as to this Honourable House shall seem fit.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 5.

PETITION of *Joseph Dandridge* against the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company.—20 March 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Joseph Dandridge*, of Wood-street, Hair-dresser,

Showeth,

That your petitioner has been shown the printed Votes and Proceedings, and Supplement thereto, of your Honourable House for the 16th day of March instant, wherein a certain petition of one Richard Lill, of Vauxhall, grocer, appears; and in whose petition it is alleged, that amongst the subscribers to the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company are many needy persons, totally and notoriously unable to meet their liabilities under the subscription deed of the said company, and some of whom were induced to subscribe their names thereto as the creatures of others, who, being unwilling to incur the responsibility of executing the deed themselves, procured such needy individuals to do so on consideration of a small commission, and that, amongst ten names, your petitioner's name and address appears as one of such needy and unprincipled persons.

Your petitioner indignantly denies that he is either a needy or unprincipled person, and declares that such charge, as referring to himself, is a foul, false and infamous libel.

Your petitioner has been informed, and believes, that the said Richard Lill keeps a small chandler's shop, and is in indigent circumstances, and that he is one of a body of individuals, who, taking advantage of the present clamour against railways and joint-stock companies, and of the inquiries now proceeding before Committees of your Honourable House as to the stability of such joint-stock companies, endeavour to extort money from the directors of such companies, or to assist civil companies, who pay them for so doing, by bringing false, unfounded and libellous charges, such as the charge brought against your petitioner.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays, that your Honourable House will thoroughly sift and investigate the truth of the allegation in the petition of the said Richard Lill, so far as the same concerns your petitioner; and that in case the said Richard Lill cannot substantiate the charge he has preferred against your petitioner, that your Honourable House will cause such relief to be given to your petitioner for the false, foul and infamous libel which your Honourable House has ordered to be printed, as to your Honourable House shall seem just, wise and expedient.

And your petitioner shall ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 6.

Appendix, No. 6. Petition of R. Lill.

PETITION of *Richard Lill.*—21 March 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Richard Lill*, of Vauxhall, Grocer,

Showeth,

That he has been informed, that a petition was presented to this Honourable House on the 16th day of March instant, in the name of your petitioner, complaining of certain persons therein named, and charging them as therein mentioned.

That your petitioner was induced to sign said petition on the representation made to your petitioner, that it was to accompany a general petition, emanating from a number of persons on the line, who were opposed to the railway going through their lands; but your petitioner never intended that he was alone to present a private or individual petition.

That your petitioner is unacquainted with the persons or circumstances of the individuals mentioned in said petition of the 16th instant, and never intended to bring charges or wound the feelings of any persons, much less of those persons named in the said petition, whom your petitioner does not know.

That counsel attending on the Committee of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway, and in opposition thereto, stated that he appeared as counsel for your petitioner, and obtained two adjournments of the proceedings before the Committee, until the merits of your petitioner's petition had been gone into before this Honourable House.

That your petitioner has never instructed any person to employ counsel on his behalf to prosecute said petition; nor is it your petitioner's wish or desire that such petition should be proceeded with.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays, that he may be permitted to withdraw his said petition of the 16th instant, presented to this Honourable House.

And your petitioner shall ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 7.

PETITION of *F. T. Bircham* and *Clement Francis.*—4 April 1837.

Appendix, No. 7. Petition of F. T. Bircham and Clement Francis.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Francis Thomas Bircham*, of 52, Lincoln's Inn Fields, in the county of Middlesex, Solicitor, and *Clement Francis*, of 63, Lincoln's Inn Fields, aforesaid, Gentleman,

Showeth,

That a Bill is now pending before your Honourable House, intituled, "A Bill for making and maintaining a Railway from the South End of Southwark Bridge to join other Railways at or near the South and West Parts of the Metropolis."

That such Bill has been read a second time and referred to a Committee of your Honourable House, and that divers petitions have been presented against such Bill and referred to such Committee.

That amongst other petitions against such Bill, a petition was presented to your Honourable House on the 16th day of March last by Richard Lill, of Vauxhall, in the county of Surrey, grocer, complaining, amongst other things, that the subscription contract deed for constructing the said railway has been improperly executed, and praying for inquiry with reference thereto; and your Honourable House was pleased to refer the matters of the said petition to the consideration of the Select Committee to which the Deptford and Dover subscription list had been then some time since referred.

That on the 20th day of March last a second petition was presented to this Honourable House by the said Richard Lill, stating, amongst other things, that he had been induced to sign his said former petition on the representation that it was to accompany a general petition emanating from a number of persons on the line who were opposed to the railway going through their lands, but that he never intended that he was alone to present a private or individual petition; that he was unacquainted with the persons or circumstances of the individuals mentioned in his said former petition, and that counsel attended the Committee on the said Bill, and in opposition thereto, stating that he appeared as counsel for the said petitioner Richard Lill, but that he the said Richard Lill had never instructed any person to employ counsel on his behalf, and praying that he might be permitted to withdraw his said former petition.

That your petitioners have been informed, that it has been publicly stated that the said Richard Lill was in a state of intoxication when he signed the said first-mentioned petition.

That the said first-mentioned petition of the said Richard Lill was prepared by your petitioner Francis Thomas Bircham, in pursuance of instructions which he received from a committee

mittee appointed at a meeting of owners and occupiers and other parties interested in property affected by the line of the said proposed railway, held on the 13th day of March last, and that the said petition was founded on the information which your petitioner obtained at that meeting, and by subsequent inquiries in various quarters.

That the said Richard Lill attended the said meeting and spoke against the said proposed railway, declared himself more strongly than any other person present an opponent thereof, and twice voluntarily expressed himself to your petitioner, Francis Thomas Bircham, as most anxious to do anything he could to defeat it, and voluntarily offered to your petitioner, Francis Thomas Bircham, to subscribe towards a fund for the purpose of more effectually resisting the progress of the said Bill.

That your petitioner, Francis Thomas Bircham, never saw the said Richard Lill upon the matters of the said first-mentioned petition previous to the signing thereof; but on the 16th day of March last your petitioner, Francis Thomas Bircham, sent your petitioner, Clement Francis, to the said Richard Lill with the said petition, having particularly instructed the said Clement Francis that the said Richard Lill was not to be persuaded in any manner to sign the same, but that he should only be permitted to sign it in case he should be found perfectly willing to do so, after statement to him of the allegations thereof, and that the petition would very probably be printed, but that the proceedings which would be taken upon it, to prove the allegations thereof, would be without expense to the said Richard Lill.

That your petitioner, Clement Francis, did accordingly, as requested by your petitioner Francis Thomas Bircham, attend the said Richard Lill with the said petition, at his residence between 2 and 3 o'clock in the afternoon of the 16th day of March last, and after having read to him the said petition, and stated that it had been ascertained that the allegations thereof were true, and that the said petition would be presented and proceeded upon without expense to the said Richard Lill, he the said Richard Lill, freely, voluntarily, and without persuasion of any kind, signed the said petition.

That your petitioners cannot account to your Honourable House how it is that the said Richard Lill believed that he was not about to present a private or individual petition, because your petitioner, Clement Francis, at the beginning of his interview with the said Richard Lill, read to him the said petition, which was throughout in the singular number, and stated to him that the said petition purported to be the petition of him the said Richard Lill only; and although some conversation afterwards took place as to procuring other signatures thereto, for which purpose your petitioner would have altered the language of the said petition, your petitioner, Clement Francis, cannot conceive how the said Richard Lill could misunderstand the result of that conversation, inasmuch as the intention to get further signatures was, after calling with the said Richard Lill on one gentleman who was from home, distinctly abandoned, and the said Richard Lill, without persuasion, agreed that the said petition should be his alone, as originally intended.

That your petitioner, Clement Francis, did not state to the said Richard Lill that the petition he was about to sign would accompany any other petition, to be signed by any other person or persons, and cannot therefore account to your Honourable House by what means the said Richard Lill was induced to believe that such would be the case. And your petitioner, Clement Francis, positively states that he saw nothing in the manner of the said Richard Lill which was in his opinion indicative of intoxication, and he did not then and does not now believe that the said Richard Lill was otherwise than perfectly sober at the time he so signed his said first petition; and both your petitioners most positively and solemnly deny that they, or either of them, used any means to intoxicate the said Richard Lill, or that they or either of them would have allowed the said Richard Lill to sign any such document, if he had been to their knowledge otherwise than perfectly sober at the time, and able to understand the nature of the act he was doing.

That the prayer of the said first petition being to be heard by counsel, your petitioner, Francis Thomas Bircham, instructed counsel to appear before the Committee on the said Bill, on the 17th day of March last, for the purpose of suggesting to that Honourable Committee that it might be convenient to adjourn the proceedings on the said Bill until it was seen what steps your Honourable House would take as to the said first petition of the said Richard Lill: that the Committee adopted the suggestion of counsel, and adjourned to the 20th day of March last; but your Honourable House not having in the intermediate time made any order upon the said first petition, the said Committee, on the like suggestion of counsel, adjourned from the 20th day of March last to the 5th day of April instant.

That your petitioner, Francis Thomas Bircham, freely admits that he neither asked nor received any instructions from the said Richard Lill to retain counsel to appear on the said first petition; but your petitioner, Francis Thomas Bircham, considered himself fully authorized to act in pursuance of the prayer of the said petition, and he felt no doubt that in so doing he had the entire concurrence of the said Richard Lill.

That on the said 20th day of March last your petitioner, Francis Thomas Bircham, when attending the Committee on the said Bill at their said adjourned sitting, was called out of the room to speak with the said Richard Lill, who stated to your petitioner that he had become alarmed concerning the said petition, and conceived that he might be made liable to pay costs, or be prosecuted for libel, on account thereof, and was therefore anxious to withdraw the same; that considerable discussion ensued thereupon between the said Richard Lill and his solicitor on the one hand, and your petitioner and the counsel retained on the said petition on the other, in the course of which the said Richard Lill and his solicitor more than once stated that no improper inducement had been used to obtain the said Richard Lill's signature to the said first petition.

City Railway.

Appendix, No. 7.

That no proceedings were taken by your petitioner upon the said first petition of the said Richard Lill after he became aware that the said Richard Lill was desirous to withdraw the same, until the said Richard Lill and his said solicitor consented that the proceedings thereupon should continue for the present, which they shortly afterwards did, the said Richard Lill's said solicitor intimating that he thought an indemnity should be given to protect the said Richard Lill from the payment of costs and from the consequences of any proceeding for libel upon the said petition.

That on the same day (but after the said adjournment of the said Committee to the said 5th day of April instant) your petitioner, Francis Thomas Bircham, called on the said Richard Lill's said solicitor, in whose hands it was understood that the said Richard Lill had left the matter, and was told by him that he should not at present advise the said Richard Lill to withdraw his said petition, but that if the same were proceeded on he should require such indemnity as aforesaid on his behalf; and your petitioner stated to the said Richard Lill's solicitor that he would see him again on the subject within three or four days, when he had further considered the matter.

That in the evening of the same day your Honourable House referred the said petition of the said Richard Lill to the Select Committee on the Deptford and Dover Railway Subscription List, for inquiry into the allegations thereof, and on the same evening a petition by certain of the directors of the said Southwark and Hammersmith Railway was presented to your Honourable House, praying, amongst other things, that the Committee, to whom the said petition of the said Richard Lill was referred, might report whether the said Richard Lill, or certain other parties in the now stating petition mentioned, should not be bound to pay the costs of the directors of the said Southwark and Hammersmith Railway, in replying to and disproving the allegations of the petition of the said Richard Lill.

That the said second petition of the said Richard Lill was presented to your Honourable House on the following evening, no communication beyond those hereinbefore stated having taken place between the said Richard Lill or any person on his behalf and your petitioners.

That your petitioner Francis Thomas Bircham, previously to the preparation of the said first petition of the said Richard Lill, made many inquiries as to the matters therein contained, and he hath subsequently continued the same; and your petitioner at the time the said petition was prepared believed, and still believes, that the allegations of the said petition are true, and is convinced that if the investigation thereby prayed shall be made, the good faith of your petitioner will be fully established with reference thereto.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray your Honourable House, that they may stand acquitted by your Honourable House of any unfair or improper conduct with reference to the said first petition of the said Richard Lill, and that your Honourable House will be pleased to refer the matters of this petition, and of the second petition of the said Richard Lill, to the same Committee to whom the said first petition stands referred, in order that such Committee may fully inquire into all the circumstances and allegations of the said several petitions, and that your petitioners may be heard by their counsel, agents and witnesses touching the same, and that all parties concerned in any manner therein, or who can afford information as to the premises, may be fully examined with reference thereto.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 8.

PETITION of the London and Southampton Railway Company.—4 April 1837.

Appendix, No. 8. Petition of the London and Southampton Railway Company.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the London and Southampton Railway Company, under their common seal,

Showeth,

That a Bill has been introduced into your Honourable House and is now pending therein, intituled, "A Bill for making and maintaining a Railway from the South End of Southwark Bridge to join other Railways at or near the South and West Parts of the Metropolis."

That a petition was presented to your Honourable House on the 20th day of March last, by certain directors of the railway proposed to be established by the said Bill, alleging, amongst other things, that one Richard Lill had been induced to make and present a certain petition to your Honourable House by the directors and promoters of the London and Southampton Railway Company, and that they had so acted therein, because, in certain negotiations referred to in the said first-mentioned petition, the said directors of the said Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company would not consent to certain exorbitant and unjust terms, which the said first-mentioned petition alleges were sought to be imposed upon them the said directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company by your petitioners.

That your petitioners deny that they were instrumental in the presentation of the said petition of the said Richard Lill, any further than that agents of your petitioners attended a meeting of opponents of the said measure on the 13th day of March last, and that one of such agents became a member of a committee appointed at such meeting, by the instructions of which committee your petitioners believe the said petition was framed.

That

That your petitioners deny, that as to any part which they have taken in opposition to the said Bill, they have been instigated by the motives stated in the said petition of the directors of the said Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company, or that your petitioners have sought to make exorbitant or unjust terms in any negotiations which they have had with the said directors of the said Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company.

City Railway.

Appendix, No. 8.

That your petitioners have already caused a petition under their common seal to be presented to this Honourable House, complaining of the several matters therein referred to; but your petitioners had not, at the time of the presentation of such their first petition, received any information with reference to the several statements contained in the petition of the said Richard Lill.

That your petitioners have since received information which has induced them to believe that all the allegations contained in the said last-mentioned petition are true, and deserve the careful investigation of this Honourable House; and feeling that their interests and those of the public at large are greatly concerned that the powers sought to be obtained by the promoters of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway should not be granted if the subscribers thereto are not responsible or sufficient, your petitioners are desirous that the matters referred to in the petition of the said Richard Lill, and particularly the allegation that individuals have signed the said subscription contract who are unable to meet their engagements under the same, should be fully inquired into.

That your petitioners are informed, and believe, that many of the subscribers to the said undertaking are imperfectly and incorrectly described in the said subscription contract deed, and that several of them cannot be found or heard of at the addresses set forth in such deed.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray your Honourable House, that the said Richard Lill may not be allowed to withdraw his said petition, but that the matters thereof and of this petition may still be inquired into by the Select Committee to whom the said petition of the said Richard Lill stands referred, and that your petitioners may be allowed to appear before such Committee by their counsel, agents and witnesses, with reference to such of the allegations thereof as they may conceive it to their interest to assist in the investigation of.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 9.

PETITION of the Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company, 4 April 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

Appendix, No. 9. Petition of the Directors of Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Directors of the Southwark and Hammersmith (formerly called the City of London and Richmond) Railway,

Showeth,

That on the 16th day of March last one Richard Lill presented a petition to your Honourable House, alleging that certain frauds had been committed for the purpose of evading the orders of your Honourable House, and that certain individuals therein named were in insolvent circumstances and unable to fulfil engagements entered into by them in regard to the said railway, which petition your Honourable House directed to be printed, and ordered to be taken into consideration by the Committee on the Dover and Deptford Railway Bill.

That on Friday the 17th, and again on Monday the 20th days of March, the Committee on the said Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Bill met, and your petitioners were fully prepared on both occasions to enter into the case, their counsel, agents and witnesses being in attendance, when, on the said 20th day of March, Mathew Davenport Hill, Esq., King's counsel, rose up, and declaring that he was counsel for the said Richard Lill and retained by him, prayed that no further proceedings might take place before the Committee on the Bill until the petition of the said Richard Lill had been first heard and considered by the said Committee on the Dover and Deptford Railway Bill; upon which the Honourable Committee, then sitting, believing the said statement to be true, a second time adjourned their meeting until Wednesday the 5th day of April, to the very great loss, delay and injury of the suitors for the said Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Bill.

That on the 21st day of March the said Richard Lill petitioned your Honourable House for leave to withdraw his said petition, alleging that he had been grossly imposed upon by the parties who had brought him the former petition for his signature; that he was not aware of its contents, but thought it a general petition against the said Southwark and Hammersmith Railway; that he knew nothing whatever of the parties whom he had been made to charge with insolvency and inability to fulfil their contracts, and that he had never retained counsel to oppose your petitioners, and that the statement of the said Mathew Davenport Hill, whereby your petitioners' Bill was delayed and thrown over the recess, was false and unfounded in every respect.

That your petitioners have since discovered that the parties who put forward the said Richard Lill are connected with another railway called the Southampton Railway; that the person who brought the said petition to the said Richard Lill was a clerk to F. T. Bircham of Lincoln's Inn Fields, solicitor; that Messrs. Few, Hamilton and Few, solicitors to the said Southampton Railway, settled the same, and that the motive of these false representations

City Railway.

Appendix, No. 9.

was to force your petitioners (by putting them to a great and serious expense and inconvenience, through successful impositions upon your Honourable House,) to make terms with the said Southampton Railway Company, ruinous to the interests of the Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company, and flagrantly extortionate and unjust.

That the said parties are still at work by tortuous and false representations to induce individuals to petition your Honourable House, and, having through the petition of the said Richard Lill succeeded in inducing your Honourable House to postpone the progress of your petitioners' Bill, hope by a continuance of such conduct to force your petitioners into their terms, or defeat the Bill of your petitioners altogether.

That accordingly another petition has been presented to your Honourable House, alleging that your petitioners had changed the name of their railway from "The City of London and Richmond Railway," to "The Southwark and Hammersmith Railway," and that the petitioners had been deceived and lulled into security by not perceiving that the former was going forward; whereas your petitioners never did change the name of their said railway, but such change was made by certain officers of your Honourable House without the knowledge of your petitioners, and for the purpose, as they understand, of more exactly expressing the termini of such railway, which changes have been made in many other railways by the said officers for such purposes as aforesaid.

That in order to show that your petitioners never contemplated any such deception, immediately on their Bill being read a second time in your Honourable House, they advertised in the Times, Morning Chronicle, Morning Herald, and other public journals, that it had been so read under the original title, and not under the new title which had been given to it by the officers of your Honourable House.

That by these and other vexatious and groundless proceedings set on foot by the said Southampton Railway Company, for such purposes as aforesaid, justice is denied or delayed to your petitioners, and they are subjected to heavy expenses, great delay, and serious inconvenience.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray, that your Honourable House will take such steps as to your Honourable House shall seem wise, just and expedient, to inquire into the truth of the allegations of your petitioners, and to punish the parties who have imposed upon your Honourable House, and by such impositions have so delayed and injured your petitioners.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 10.

PETITION of *H. Luard.*—6 April 1837.

Appendix, No. 10. Petition of H. Luard.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Henry Luard,* of Austin Friars, in the City of London, Merchant,

Showeth,

That a Bill has been introduced into your Honourable House, intituled, "A Bill for making and maintaining a Railway from the South End of Southwark Bridge to join other Railways at or near the South and West Parts of the Metropolis."

That the original project of the promoters of the said Bill, as announced in the prospectuses and advertisements issued and published by them, and that for which (as your petitioner is informed and believes) the greater part of the money was subscribed, was to construct and maintain a railway to Richmond, with a branch across the Thames, to join the Birmingham, Bristol and Thames Junction Railway, at the Hammersmith-road, near Kensington-crescent.

That your petitioner being at that time a resident at Richmond, and feeling a strong desire to promote the formation of a railway thereto, was induced, on or about the 15th day of April last, to pay into the banking-house of Messrs. Whitmore, Wells and Whitmore, the sum of 100 *l.*, as the deposit upon fifty shares which he proposed holding in the said undertaking.

That your petitioner has heard with surprise that the promoters of the said Bill have abandoned their intention of making a railway to Richmond, for which purpose alone he paid the sum of money before mentioned.

That your petitioner humbly submits to your Honourable House, that the said sum of 100 *l.* having been paid for a specific purpose, cannot be applied to any other, without the sanction and authority of your petitioner.

That the said alteration in their plan has been made by the promoters of the Bill without his knowledge, consent or authority, he never having signed, nor seen any agreement, contract or other deed, empowering them to abandon that or any other part of their original plan.

Your petitioner immediately upon discovering that the said company had abandoned the line to Richmond, applied for the return of his deposit, and to have his name withdrawn altogether from the company, but his requests have been refused.

Your petitioner believes that many others of the persons whose deposits were received are similarly situated with your petitioner; and your petitioner is advised, that such parties having

having a right with your petitioner to have their names entirely erased from all connexion with the company, and to have their deposits returned, cannot be deemed and taken by your Honourable House as subscribers to the said undertaking of a Hammersmith railway only, nor reported as such; and that the promoters of the said Bill should be stayed in their proceedings until they shall have returned to your petitioner and to others in a like situation their deposits, and released them from all interest or concern in the said company. That your petitioner is advised that it is competent to the Committee of your Honourable House to adjourn the Committee, and to refuse to proceed with the said Bill, until your petitioner and such other dissentients as aforesaid shall have been satisfied by the promoters of the said Bill for their just demands.

Your petitioner therefore most humbly prays, that the further progress of the said Bill may be stayed, until your petitioner shall have received back his said deposit, and that the said Bill may not pass into a law, and that your petitioner may be heard by himself, his counsel, agents and witnesses, against the same, and the preamble thereof, and upon all such inquiries relating to the same measure as shall be involved in the consideration of the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th and 16th Resolutions as to railway bills, agreed to by your Honourable House on the 1st of March 1836.

And your petitioner will ever pray.

Appendix, No. 11.

PETITION of *C. J. Blunt.*—4 May 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Charles John Blunt*, of No. 85, Fleet-street, in the City of London, Civil Engineer,

Showeth,

That your petitioner humbly begs to submit to your Honourable House, that there is a Bill now pending in your Honourable House, called the "City of London, Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company," and that several petitions have been presented to your Honourable House, complaining of gross impropriety of conduct on the part of the said railway company and its officers, which said petitions are referred to the Deptford and Dover Select Committee of your Honourable House, to inquire into the allegations of the said petitions.

That your humble petitioner was induced to advance to the said directors and solicitors of the City of London, Southwark and Hammersmith Railway Company several hundreds of pounds at the solicitation of the said company, on the express undertaking, on the part of its directors and solicitor, that such sums were to be used for and solely applied towards the payment of the fees payable to your Honourable House, and other expenses attendant upon the passing of the said Bill for the incorporation of the said company.

That your humble petitioner now learns with great surprise and regret, that the said fees due to your Honourable House have not been paid, and that the said sums of money so advanced to the said company, for such purpose, by your humble petitioner, have been dishonestly, and in bad faith with your humble petitioner, applied by the directors and solicitor of the said company to dishonest purposes, whereby your humble petitioner will be defrauded by the said directors and solicitor of his money.

That your petitioner has recently discovered that it is the intention on the part of the said solicitor and directors not really and in good faith to prosecute the said Bill through your Honourable House, although such sums were obtained from your petitioner for such purpose.

That your petitioner is prepared to prove that a gross fraud is contemplated to be practised upon your humble petitioner and the shareholders by the directors and solicitor of the said railway company, by its actually being the intention of the said directors and solicitor not to prosecute the said Bill through your Honourable House, but merely to carry the said Bill to such a stage as, in the opinion of the said directors and solicitor, will entitle them to retain and keep for their own use the funds so improperly obtained from your humble petitioner, and the shareholders of the said railway company.

That to effect the above objects an effort has lately been made to screen the directors and solicitor of the said company from their presumed liability to your humble petitioner, and the *bonâ fide* shareholders, by an irregular and mock exhibition before the Committee on the Bill, in breach of the privileges of your Honourable House.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays the protection of your Honourable House, and that his petition may be referred to a Select Committee of your Honourable House, to inquire into the truth of the same, and in support of which serious charges your petitioner has ample evidence to offer. And your humble petitioner further prays that he may be permitted to be heard by counsel, solicitor, agent, or in person, before such Committee, or in such manner as your Honourable House may think fit.

And your humble petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 12.

City Railway.

COPY of Parliamentary Contract of the City (or Southwark and Hammersmith) Railway.

Appendix, No. 12. Copy of Parliamentary Contract of the City (or Southwark and Hammersmith) Railway.

This indenture, made the 13th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1836, between Hans Busk, of Great Cumberland-place, Hyde-park, in the county of Middlesex, Esq., Frederick Polhill, of Howbury-hall, in the county of Bedford, Esq., Henry Charles Dakeyne, of No. 14, Hamilton-terrace, in the county of Middlesex, Esq., of the first part; Richard Cooke, of Grove-terrace Lodge, Kentish-town, in the county of Middlesex, Esq., and John Henry Walker, of No. 23, Charlotte-street, Bloomsbury, in the county of Middlesex, Esq., of the second part; and the several other persons whose names are or shall be subscribed, and seals affixed hereto, of the third part, witnesseth, that each of the several parties hereto of the first part, to the extent of the sum of money hereunder written, and set opposite to his name, and so far as relates to the acts and defaults of himself, his heirs, executors, and administrators, but not further or otherwise, doth hereby, for himself, his heirs, executors and administrators, declare and covenant to and with the parties hereto of the second part, their executors and administrators, and each of the several parties hereto of the second and third parts respectively, to the extent of the sum of money hereunder written and set opposite to the name of him and her respectively, and so far as relates to the acts and defaults of himself and herself respectively, and of his and her respective heirs, executors and administrators, but not further or otherwise, doth hereby for himself, and herself respectively, and his and her respective heirs, executors and administrators, declare and covenant, to and with the said parties hereto of the first part, their executors and administrators, in manner following, (that is to say,) that they the said parties hereto, have subscribed the several sums hereunder written and set opposite to their respective names, for the purpose of making and establishing a railway, to be called by the name of "The City Railway," or by such other name or names as may at any time, or from time to time hereafter, be adopted by the directors for the time being, of the undertaking hereby agreed upon and to commence at or near the southern extremity of Southwark Bridge, in the parish of St. Saviour, in the borough of Southwark, in the county of Surrey; and as to one line thereof, to terminate at or near the village of Richmond, in the county of Surrey; and as to the other line thereof, after leaving the said Richmond line, at or near Battersea, in the county of Surrey, and crossing the river Thames by means of a proper viaduct, or bridge, to terminate at a place or places to be selected by the said directors, in the lines or at the extremities of the London and Birmingham Railway, and the Great Western Railway respectively, in the parishes, boundaries, hamlets or villages of Fulham, Hammersmith, and Acton, or some or one of them, in the county of Middlesex, or else, at the discretion of the said directors, to terminate in the line or at the southern extremity of a railway proposed to be called "The Birmingham and Thames Junction Railway," for the construction and establishment whereof a company has been already formed; and as to each of the said lines of railway, to proceed by such course, and through such parishes or places as the said directors may deem most expedient, together with the said viaduct or bridge, and such proper branches from the said main lines, or either of them, to any railways, works, places or bridges, at a distance respectively of not more than two miles from the said main lines, or one of them; and such proper wharfs, warehouses, and other works and erections, including houses, shops, and other buildings, in or under any of the arches so built for supporting any parts or part of the said railway as to the said directors may seem expedient, or so much of the said railway and other works as shall be authorized by Parliament; and that the said undertaking shall be constructed, established, and conducted under an Act or Acts of Parliament, to be by the said directors applied for and obtained in the next session, or some subsequent session or sessions of Parliament, and that it is intended by such Act, or if more than one, by the first of such Acts of Parliament, to constitute the subscribers to the said undertaking, and their respective successors, executors, administrators and assigns, a corporation for the purposes of the said undertaking, and effectually to protect each of the said subscribers, and the successors, heirs, executors, administrators and assigns of each of them, from all liability whatsoever, beyond the amount actually subscribed by each of them respectively, and that it is also intended thereby to regulate the calls to be from time to time made on the said subscribers, so as to prevent any one of the said calls from exceeding 10 *l.* per share, or from being made within three months after the last preceding call; and that it is also intended thereby to make the shares in the said undertaking transferable, and that the said directors for the time being have, and shall continue to have, full power to fix, and from time to time, as occasion may require, to vary the several places at which respectively the said main lines of railway, or either of them, are or is, or shall be intended to commence and terminate, and the intermediate course of the said lines respectively, and the place at which one of the said lines shall leave the other of the said lines, and the situation, number, course, direction, extent, and other circumstances, of any branches therefrom, and the situation, extent, and other circumstances, of the said wharfs, warehouses, arches, and other works, and to make, and from time to time to renew, or at the discretion of the said directors, to defer application to Parliament for all or any of the purposes aforesaid, and if occasion shall require, to confine any such application to Parliament in the next or in any future session, to one of the said main lines of railway, or to any portion or portions of the said railway and works, deferring to a future session, or altogether relinquishing their application to Parliament for the other main line on the residue of the said railway and works, or any part thereof, and to consent to the introduction into any such Act or Acts of any

any clauses which may be deemed necessary for rendering the money so subscribed as aforesaid, or any part thereof, applicable to making and establishing so much of the said railway and works as have been from time to time authorized by Parliament; and all such other clauses not inconsistent with these presents, as the said directors shall consider beneficial to the said undertaking, and that all the said parties hereto respectively, or their respective heirs, executors or administrators, will pay the money so subscribed by them respectively as aforesaid, within the space of five years from the obtaining the said Act of Parliament, at such times and places, in such sums, and to such persons as the said Act, or such of the said Acts, if more than one, as shall regulate the said payments, shall require or direct. In witness, &c.

Appendix, No. 13.

COPY of Subscribers' Agreement, City (or Southwark and Hammersmith) Railway.

We, the several persons who have hereunto subscribed our names, being respectively subscribers to an undertaking for making and establishing a railway, to be called by the name of "The City Railway," or by such other name or names as may be adopted by the directors for the time being of the said undertaking, and all proper works connected with the said railway, do hereby agree that the following persons, namely,

Albert William Beetham, Esq., F. R. S., F. L. S., Tulse-hill, Brixton, county of Surrey,
H. Busk, Esq. Great-cumberland-place, Hyde-park, Middlesex,
Richard Cooke, Esq., Grove-terrace-lodge, Kentish-town, Middlesex,
Henry Charles Dakeyne, Esq., Hamilton-terrace, Middlesex,
James C. Disney, Esq.
Thomas Smith Goode, Esq., Cateaton-street, London,
Robert Hay Graham, M. D., East Acton, Middlesex,
Augustus William Hillary, Esq., Chester-place, Regent's-park, Middlesex,
The Honourable Warwick Lake, Chertsey, county of Surrey,
Admiral Maitland Montague-square, Middlesex,
Major Macnamara, M. P., Ennistymon, county of Clare, Ireland,
The Honourable Frederick W. Mullin, M. P. Kerry, Ireland,
Frederick Polhill, Esq., M. P., Howbry-hall, county of Bedford,
John S. Leger, Esq., 22, Baker-street, Middlesex,
Sir William Rawlins, Knight, Liverpool-street, city of London,
John Henry Walker, Esq., Charlotte-street, Bloomsbury, Middlesex,

are the present directors of the said undertaking; and that they and such other of the said subscribers, each holding twenty shares at least, as the directors thereof for the time being shall in their discretion appoint, either in addition to their number, or in place of any director or directors who may have died or resigned, or become incapable of acting, shall be the directors for the time being of the said undertaking, until the said undertaking shall be authorized by Act of Parliament.

And moreover, each of us, in addition to the covenants on his part, contained in an indenture or Parliamentary contract, of even date herewith, doth hereby for himself, his heirs, executors, and administrators, agree with the said directors for the time being to observe and keep the several regulations for the management of the said undertaking, until the same shall be authorized by Act of Parliament, which are hereinafter contained; (that is to say)

1st. The said directors for the time being have, and shall continue to have, full power to procure such surveys, reports and estimates, and enter into such arrangements and contracts, and do or cause to be done such other acts as shall in their judgment be necessary or expedient for or towards carrying into effect the said undertaking as described in the said Parliamentary contract; and for or towards obtaining an Act or Acts of Parliament for establishing such undertaking, or for or towards any purpose connected therewith or incident thereto, and to make and establish such bye-laws and rules not inconsistent with the said Parliamentary contract, or with these presents, as they may deem necessary or expedient in or for the good management of the said undertaking.

2d. The acts of the majority of directors present at any of their meetings when five directors at least shall be present, shall be deemed the acts of all the directors; but the director in the chair at any such meeting shall not vote, except upon an equal division of votes, and may then give a casting vote. The time, place and mode of holding every such meeting, and the rules for regulating the same in other respects, and the manner of convening the same, shall be determined by the directors.

3d. The directors may delegate to any committee chosen from amongst themselves such of the duties and powers of the directors as they shall think proper.

4th. Each director shall be entitled to such reasonable remuneration for his attendance on the affairs of the said undertaking as the said directors shall from time to time determine; every director who shall have ceased to hold twenty shares at least in the said undertaking, or shall have been declared by the other directors incapable of acting as such director, or shall have delivered his written resignation to the solicitor for the time being of the said undertaking, shall thenceforth be deemed to be no longer a director of the said undertaking.

5th. The directors may suspend or remove Messrs. Whitmore & Co., and Messrs. Ransom & Co. the present bankers; Francis Beetham Esq., the present solicitor, and Charles John Blunt and William Laxton, Esqrs., the present engineers and surveyors of the said undertaking, and Jonas Binns Esq., the present secretary, or any of them, for wilful breach of duty, or for incompetency, but not for any other cause, without the consent of the

City Railway.

Appendix, No. 13.

majority of the subscribers present at a general meeting of the said subscribers, to be convened by the directors by advertisement in two of the London morning papers ten days at least before such meeting; and, subject only to such restrictions as aforesaid, the directors may suspend and remove, as they shall see occasion, the bankers, solicitors, engineers, surveyors, secretary, clerks, agents, workmen, and other persons from time to time employed in or about the affairs of the said undertaking.

6th. The directors are authorized to apply such monies as they shall have received from the deposits of 2*l.* per share, made by the subscribers respectively before executing these presents, in payment of the expenses already incurred, or to be incurred, of or incident to the said surveyors' reports and estimates, and soliciting and obtaining such Act or Acts of Parliament as in the said Parliamentary contract mentioned, and the other purposes aforesaid, or any of them; and so much of the said monies as for the time being shall not have been so applied, or any part thereof, may be invested by the said directors, in the names of any four of them, in any of the Government or other public funds or of Exchequer bills, (all income profit, and loss whereon shall belong to, and be borne by the said undertaking; and the surplus, if any, of the said expenses, which the said monies, income and profit shall not be sufficient to discharge, shall be borne and paid by the said subscribers rateably at the expiration of four years from the date hereof, if the said undertaking shall not then have been authorized by Act of Parliament.

7th. There shall be raised in shares of 50 *l.* each, for the purposes of the said undertaking, a capital of one million pounds, subject to such augmentation as the directors may from time to time deem advisable.

8th. No share in the said capital shall be transferable until authorized by Act of Parliament. In witness, &c.

Appendix, No. 14.
List of Subscribers.

Appendix, No. 14.
LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

CHRISTIAN AND SURNAME.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Profession or Calling.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.	(L. S.)	
Hans Busk	Gt. Cumberland-pl.	esquire	20	1,000	—	
Frederick Polhill	Howbury-hall, Beds.	esquire	20	1,000	—	
H. C. Dakeyne	14, Hamilton-terr.	esquire	20	1,000	—	
Richard Cooke	Grove-terr.-lodge, Kentish-town.	esquire	20	1,000	—	
J. H. Walker	Charlotte-street Bloomsbury.	surgeon	20	1,000	—	-- Francis Beetham.
T. Smith Good	Cateaton-street	merchant	20	1,000	—	
R. H. Graham	E. Acton, Middx.	M. D.	20	1,000	—	
James C. Disney	Herald's College	esquire	20	1,000	—	
William Rawlins	Liverpool-street	knight	20	1,000	—	
James Maitland	Montague-square	Royal Navy	20	1,000	—	
William H. Barron	86, Albany-street, Regent's-park.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
George Muir	6, Chiswell-street	stay-maker	4	200	—	
Andrew Cohen	19, Fenchurch-st.	merchant	20	1,000	—	
Julius C. Flindt	John's Coffee-house	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
John L. Crawford	Nottingham-street	merchant	20	1,000	—	
Edward Garland	29, Lloyd-square	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
John St. Leger	22, Baker-st. Portman-square.	capt. (army)	20	1,000	—	
Richard Gurney	13, King-street, St. James's.	esquire	100	5,000	—	
John Shearman	Jun. U. S. Club	captain	50	2,500	—	
George Whittington	Quality-court Chancery-lane.	gentleman	12	600	—	
Henry Collinson	17, Bedford-place, Russell-square.	gentleman	25	1,250	—	-- Edward Beetham.
J. N. Castello	11, Beaumont-st.	gentleman	25	1,250	—	
Richard H. Sharpe	108, Cheapside	gentleman	10	500	—	
William Bryan	Auction Mart	waiter	10	500	—	
James Pananco	Change-alley	gentleman	25	1,250	—	
Henry Gunson	Adam's-ct. Broad-st	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
J. M. Maude	32, Gt. Winchester-st.	gentleman	15	750	—	
Francis Drake	107, Stamford-st.	merchant	100	5,000	—	
Joseph Heenan	39, Prince's-road, Kennington.	gentleman	15	750	—	
Henry de Medina	32, Fitzroy-square	gentleman	15	750	—	
R. P. Edkins	3, Terrace, Kensington	gentleman	10	500	—	
E. Jarman	12, Church-street, Islington.	gentleman	5	250	—	
J. Levy	63, Pleasant-place, West-sq. Lambeth.	gentleman	30	1,500	—	

CHRISTIAN AND SURNAME.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Profession or Calling.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.	(L. S.)	
William Mayne -	20, Brunswick-par.	gentleman -	10	500	—	
H. Carmichael Smyth	18, Albion-street, Hyde-park.	gentleman -	50	2,500	—	
E. H. Lindo - -	14, St. Mary-Axe -	merchant -	10	500	—	
J. Dandrige - -	102, Wood-street -	gentleman -	80	4,000	—	
James Taylor - -	43, Lombard-street	fishmonger	15	750	—	
Gs. Edward Berkers -	2, Hill-street, Walworth.	gentleman -	60	3,000	—	
Andrew M'Ewen -	30, Dean-st. Soho -	tailor -	10	500	—	
Charles Fox Smith -	64, Queen-street -	gentleman -	20	1,000	—	
William King - -	4, Albion-terrace, Stepney.	surgeon -	3	150	—	
Wm. Henry Thompson	44, Up. Norton-st. Letters to be sent to Stone, Martin, Stone & Co.	esquire -	100	5,000	—	
Richard Layfield -	24, Gt. Pulteney-st.	cabinetmaker	10	500	—	
George Bassett - -	1, Southampton-st. Fitzroy-square.	land-agent -	20	1,000	—	
Matthew Stritch -	Ex. Office, Broad-st.	gentleman -	15	750	—	
John Rowlands - -	54, Quadrant, Regent-street.	woollen-draper.	2	100	—	
George Baber - -	10, Gt. Marlbro'-st.	- - -	15	750	—	
John Henry Martin -	23, King-st. Long-Acre.	hairdresser	10	500	—	
Lewis Edw. Engelback	59, Strand - -	gentleman -	20	1,000	—	
Henry Gunson - -	4, Adam's-ct. Broad-street.	gentleman -	30	1,500	—	
Matt. Markham Evans	40, Godfrey-street, Chelsea.	undertaker -	25	1,250	—	
E. H. Noy - -	35, Seething-lane -	solicitor -	100	5,000	—	
Charles Manby - -	1, Salisbury-street, Strand.	gentleman -	5	250	—	
John Perrett - -	Grafton-st. East -	tailor - -	25	1,250	—	
Harry Peter Wood -	3, New-sq. Minories	agent -	14	700	—	
Nathaniel Amies -	7, Somers-pl. West	gentleman -	20	1,000	—	
Henry Williams -	2, Holland-st. Clapham-road.	- - -	20	1,000	—	Edw. Beetham.
Samuel Carr - -	Upper Charles-st.	gentleman -	20	1,000	—	
Thomas Ford - -	Retreat-pl. Hackney	gentleman -	10	500	—	
Wm. B. Parry, for W. Parry and Son.	54, Regent-street -	drapers -	4	200	—	
Edward Wrench -	6, Gray's-inn-ter. -	mathematical inst.-maker	25	1,250	—	
Henry S. Smithers, jun.	106, Fenchurch-st.	gentleman -	15	750	—	
Alfred Smithers - -	5, Warnford-court	gentleman -	10	500	—	
Mary Ann Thompson	59, Gloucester-pl. Portman-square.	widow -	10	500	—	
John Morgan - -	13, Yardley-street, Clerkenwell.	gentleman -	10	500	—	
Henry Gunson - -	4, Adam's-court, Broad-street.	gentleman -	40	2,000	—	
John Whitaker - -	Custom-house -	gentleman -	10	500	—	
George Evans - -	150, Tottenham-ct. road.	silk-mercer, &c.	20	1,000	—	
William Bower - -	14, Carlton-terrace	butler -	3	150	—	
Edward Starkie Tuton	Market-street -	general draper	50	2,500	—	
			E. S. T.	E. S. T.		
William Perkins -	57, Commercial-rd. Lambeth.	appraiser -	5	250	—	
H. B. Robinson -	Montpelier-place, Twickenham.	gentleman -	10	1,000	—	
George Henry Randell	Park-rd. Clapham-road.	gentleman -	50	2,500	—	
Silous Crisp - -	35, Ranelagh-street	custom-house agent.	25	1,250	—	
Samuel Carr - -	Upper Charles-st. Northampton-sq. Middlesex.	gentleman -	40	2,000	—	
George Henry Randell	5, Park-road, Clapham-road.	gentleman -	30	1,500	—	
John Edward Stokes -	Hemsley Terrace, Hackney.	broker -	80	4,000	—	
George Graham -	11, Cheapside.	merchant -	20	1,000	—	

(*continued*)

City Railway.

Appendix, No. 14.

CHRISTIAN AND SURNAME.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Profession or Calling.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.	(L. S.)	
Charles Bamfield -	16, Angel-court -	boot-maker	10	500	—	
John Norris - -	Richmond, Surrey	auctioneer -	6	300	—	
William Hall - -	83, London-road, Southwark.	gentleman -	25	1,250	—	
William Cooke - -	8, Capel-ct. Strand	gentleman -	20	1,000	—	
John Alfred Chalk -	Loughborough-rd. Brixton.	discount-agt.	20	1,000	—	
John Merry - -	4, Bury-pl. Bloomsbury.	grocer -	5	250	—	
Edward Brenan -	41, High Holborn	gentleman -	50	2,500	—	
Wm. Algernon Lens Piercy - - -	16, Elder-st. Norton Folgate.	gentleman -	45	2,250	—	
John Dickinson -	18, Addle-st. Aldermanbury.	cloth-factor	10	500	—	
Peter Mudie - -	29, Vaughan-terrace, City-road.	gentleman -	35	1,750	—	
Edward Perrin - -	3, Devonshire-st. Queen-street.	schoolmaster	10	500	—	
R. Blackmore - -	Bonner's-hall, Hackney.	gentleman -	35	1,750	—	
Emanuel Aguilar -	41, Gt. Prescot-st.	gentleman -	10	500	—	
John Jackson - -	14, Dorset-crescent, New North-road.	gentleman -	100 C. F.	5,000 C. F.	—	
Charles Fraser - -	3, Buckingham-pl. Old Kent-road.	share-agent	20	1,000 C. F.	—	
George Garrett - -	130, Jermyn-street	coal-merchant	10	500	—	
Henry Blake - -	5, Grafton-pl. Kentish-town.	gentleman -	10	500	—	
Thomas Rose - -	38, Newgate-street	clerk - -	10	500	—	
Thomas Mellish -	13, Georgina-terrace, Kinder-st. Old Kent-road.	gentleman -	15	750	—	
J. N. Castello - -	11, Beaumont-st. Mile-end.	gentleman -	30	1,500	—	
Charles Fraser - -	3, Buckingham-pl. Old Kent-road.	agent -	10	500	—	
Henry Upwaid - -	2, Gt. St. Helens -	merchant -	30	1,500	—	Edw. Beetham.
Robert Wood - -	18, Albion-pl. Walworth.	agent -	10	500	—	
William Boswell -	14, Whitechapel -	builder -	20	1,000	—	
George Gould - -	12, George-st. Bathwick, Bath.	gentleman -	20	1,000	—	
Sarah Palmer - -	Vicarage, Dorney, near Windsor.	gentlewoman	2	100	—	
Sarah Palmer - -	ditto - - -	gentlewoman	2	100	—	
Matthew Mills - -	Gloucester-buildings, Old Kent-road.	agent -	10	500	—	
John Vaugton - -	48, Prospect-place, St. George's-rd. Southwark.	gentleman -	20	1,000	—	
Thomas Christopher Measam - -	25, Francis-st. Newington-butts.	agent -	20	1,000	—	
Henry Cooper - -	8, St. Thomas-st. Borough.	gentleman -	15	750	—	
John Jeremy - -	26, Bucklersbury -	Manchester warehouseman	20	1,000	—	
Charles Griffith -	9, Myrtle-st. Hoxton	gentleman -	10	500	—	
Thomas Willingale -	Phœnix-wharf, Wapping.	coal-merchant	20	1,000	—	
James Hay - -	51, Newgate-street	surgeon -	50	2,500	—	
William Bloxam -	Morden-cot. Surrey	stockbroker	35 W. B.	1,750 W. B.	—	
Wm. Algernon Lens Piercy - - -	15, Elder-st. Norton Folgate.	gentleman -	5	250	—	
John Clutterbuck -	40, Penton-pl. Pentonville.	gentleman -	10	500	—	
James Railton - -	2, Queen-st. Islington.	gentleman -	16	800	—	
Adolphus Fred. Esse	11, Bentinck-street, Manchester-sq.	gentleman -	10	500	—	
John Reed - -	20, Baker-st. Pentonville.	gentleman -	20	1,000	—	

CHRISTIAN AND SURNAME.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Profession or Calling.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.	(L. S.)	
John Risdon	11, Mark-lane	gentleman	5	250	—	
Moses Joseph Cushmore	11, Bevis-marks, St. Mary-Axe.	merchant	20	1,000	—	
Jos. Dandridge	102, Wood-street	gentleman	55	2,750	—	
William Hamilton	Lambeth	gentleman	80	4,000	—	
John Getting	Norwood, Surrey	merchant	20	1,000	—	
Wm. Edw. Tekusche	80, Fleet-street	merchant	20	500	—	
Joseph Della Torre	9, Lamb's-conduit-street.	merchant	20	1,000	—	
Thomas Baily Rose	28, Essex-street	barrister at law	5	250	—	
Thomas Hurdle	Royal Marine Barracks, Chatham	lieut. Royal Marines.	120	6,000	—	
George Edmonds	Wandsworth road	merchant	10	500	—	
David Nunes Carvalho	147, Fleet-street	bookseller	10	500	—	
Edwin Cocker	2, Arthur-st. London-bridge.	hardwareman	40	2,000	—	
James Milner	Pancras-vale, Hampstead-road.	gentleman	10	500	—	
John Alfred Chalk	Loughborough-rd. Brixton.	discount-agent	10	500	—	Ed. Beetham, 2, New Inn, Strand.
Cornwell Baron Wilson	8, Furnival's-inn	gentleman	10	500	—	
Joseph Amadio	118, St. John-st.-road.	optician	10	500	—	
John White	1, Prince's-street, Westminster.	surgeon	10	500	—	
Gwalter Borronskill Lonsdale	Vauxhall	gentleman	25	1,250	—	
William Jenning	31, Mitre-st. Lambeth.	attorney's clerk.	10	500	—	
D. F. Ryan	15, Mornington-crescent.	gentleman	10	500	—	
William Coles	3, Charing-cross	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
William Joseph Dixon	7, Cleveland-street, Mile-end-road.		5	250	—	
Archibald Kerr	46, Robert-street, Hoxton.	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
John Mogran	13, Yardley-street, Clerkenwell.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Fredrick Langley	4, Taunton-place, Regent's-park.	gentleman	110	5,500	—	
William Henry Land	Bristol	broker	40	2,000	—	J. Binns.
Wm. P. Lasbury	Bath	bookseller	50	2,500	—	
Samuel Ward	Knight-rider-street	gentleman	5	250	—	
Albert Wm. Beetham	Tulse-hill, Norwood.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	Edw. Beetham.
John Perrett, jun.	43, Grafton-street, East, Fitzroy-sq.	tailor	25	1,250	—	J. Binns.
Henry Lucas	Liverpool	sharebroker	25	1,250	—	
William Buck	3, Northumberland-place, Bath	hatter	2	100 H. B.	—	
Henry Bourn	24, Kingsmead-ter. Bath.	accountant	5	250	—	
James Hamper	1, Abbey-street	gentleman	40	2,000	—	
Henry Sutton	6, Westgate-buildings, Bath.	accountant	10	500	—	
William Phipps	4, Brook-st. Bath	shoemaker	5	250	—	
George Files	17, Coredore, Bath	bootmaker	5	250	—	
Wm. Edward Davis	Bear-inn, Hollmay, near Bath.	accountant	6	300	—	
Wm. Huntly Bailey	5, Chatham-row, Bath.	tailor	50	2,500	—	
Charles Fisher	12, Prior-park-buildings.	painter	10	500	—	Edw. Beetham.
Henry Lambert	28, Westgate-street	silversmith	2	100	—	
James Williams	36, Westgate-street, Bath.	cutler	2	100	—	
Sarah Smith	14, Westgate-street, Bath.	brewer	6	300	—	
John Stone	2, Wood-street	gentleman	10	500	—	
Robert Batt	12, Broad-st. Bath	poulterer	30	1,500	—	
Samuel Nicholls	2, Barton-buildings	gentleman	10	500	—	
William Turner	16, Old Bond-st.	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Wm. Huntly Bailey	5, Chatham-row, Bath.	tailor	5	250	—	

(continued)

City Railway.

Appendix, No. 14.

CHRISTIAN AND SURNAME.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Profession or Calling.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.	(L. S.)	
Joshua Henry Nunn	12, Charles-st. Bath	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Joshua Henry Nunn	ditto	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Henry Wood	Orange-grove, Bath	factor	10	500	—	Edw. Beetham.
William Thompson	Westgate-buildings, Bath.	architectural draughtsman.	15	750	—	
Wm. Huntly Bailey	5, Chatham-row, Bath.	tailor	30	1,500	—	
John Hawley	Coventry-street	goldsmith	10	500	—	
George Reynolds	21, Union-st. Bath	draper	20	1,000	—	Fra. Beetham.
Daniel Wood	5, Northgate-street, Bath.	chemist	5	250	—	
William Henry Orchard	8, Great Stanhope-street, Bath.	esquire	20	1,000	—	
Joseph Hill	5, Pulteney-bridge, Bath.	accountant	10	500	—	
Job Lockyer Seale	20, Catherine-place, Bath.	surgeon	10	500	—	
Job Lockyer Seale	Ditto	surgeon	5	250	—	
William Gover Gray	16, Alford's buildings, Bath.	attorney at law	10	500	—	
William Fortt	5, Milsom-st., Bath	confectioner	30	1,500	—	Edw. Beetham.
Euclid Shaw, for E. S. and Son	4, Darlington-st., Bath.	barge-master	10	500	—	
Robert Fowler	1, Lambridge, Bath	gentleman	10	500	—	
Thomas Fisk	5, Milsom-st., Bath	cook	2	100	—	
Horace Moger	Bathwick-hill, Bath	gentleman	5	250	—	
Robert George Moger	Bath	surgeon	40	2,000	—	
Frederick Minifie	4, Harrington-place, Bath.	accountant	5	250	—	
Henry Harford	1, Vineyards, Bath	solicitor	10	500	—	
Edward Flood	2, Old King-street, Bath.	gentleman	3	150	—	
William Bumsted	14, Bedford-row, Islington.	gentleman	10	500	—	Fra. Beetham.
George Edwards G. E. Peacock	89, Chancery-lane	solicitors	50	2,500	—	
George Bain	2, Parliament-street,	parliamentary agent.	10	500	—	Edw. Beetham.
Charles Lockington	42, Duke-street, St. James's.	stock and sharebroker.	10	500	—	J. Binns.
John Lawson	Bowness-house, Kennington-lane.	gentleman	10	500	—	
Francis Dillon	Felstead, Essex	esquire	20	1,000	—	
G. M. Gray	Staple Inn	solicitor	50	2,500	—	
Henry Weston	14, Mecklenburgh-square.	merchant	20	1,000	—	
Powers of Attorney received 26th May 1836, and signed by						
Fra. Beetham, attorney for George Atkins.	Toxteth-park, Liverpool.	grocer	5	250	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for John Kaye.	2, Dryden-street, Liverpool.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Edw. Blanchard.	193, Scotland-road	flower-dealer	10	500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Joseph Blanchard.	1, Highfield-street, Liverpool.	flower-dealer	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Thomas Baines.	Ince Blundell, near Liverpool.	farmer	10	500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for George Kaye.	Ince Blundell, near Liverpool.	farmer	10	500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for William Brown.	St. Vincent-st., East, Liverpool.	gentleman	10	500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Robert Price.	Seymour-st., Liverpool.	cooper	10	500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Henry Ormerod.	30, Brunswick-road, Liverpool.	merchant	10	500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for William Shirley	9, Ranelagh-street, Liverpool.	perfumer	10	500	—	
Francis Beetham, attorney for William Houldsworth.	Hygeia-st., Liverpool.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	

CHRISTIAN AND SURNAME.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Profession or Calling.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.	(L. S.)	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for James Hart.	Toxteth-park, Liverpool.	commission-agent.	5	250	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for F. Reckless.	Toxteth-park, Liverpool.	commission-agent.	5	250	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for John Jones.	Earle-st., Liverpool.	book-keeper	5	200	—	
26th May 1836.						
Charles Hall - -	Richmond - -	tallow-chandler.	10	500	—	
28th May 1836.						
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Ambrose Warner.	Gt. Charles-street, Birmingham.	die-sinker -	10	500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Thomas Langley.	Birmingham -	leather-factor	25	1,250	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Daniel Smith.	Bristol-street, Birmingham.	draper -	15	750	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for George Robinson Fardon.	Moseley-street, Birmingham.	factor -	25	1,250	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for T. B. Lillington.	Edge Oaston, near Birmingham.	miller -	30	1,500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for George Grove.	Small Heath, near Birmingham.	corn-merchant	40	2,000	—	
28th May 1836. 3d June 1836.						
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Edward Scharff.	15, Ardwick-green, Manchester.	merchant -	5	250	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for George Bentham.	Broughton, Manchester.	stationer -	30	1,500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for John D. Parry.	Pendleton, near Manchester.	twist-dealer	30	1,500	—	
Francis Beetham, attorney for George Bent Ollivant.	Green Heys, near Manchester.	merchant -	30	1,500	—	W. Gethen.
Fra. Beetham, attorney for William Bucknell.	Crowcroft Longsight, near Manchester.	agent -	100	5,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for James Lord.	Pendleton - -	manufacturer	20	1,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Thos. Broadbent.	Ardwick, Manchester.	merchant -	30	1,500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Charles Mann.	High-street, Manchester.	woollen-manufacturer	20	1,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Edward Royle.	Market-street, Manchester.	hatter -	20	1,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for William Brook.	Longsight, near Manchester.	manufacturer	10	250	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for James Broadbent.	Manchester - -	manufacturer	20	1,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for George Wood.	Manchester - -	merchant -	20	1,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Jas. Richardson.	Half-moon-court -	Manchester manufacturer	40	2,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Aug. S. Sichel.	5, Oxford-st., Manchester.	merchant -	50	2,500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for David Scott.	Cannon-street, Manchester.	agent -	20	1,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Isaac Hudson.	George-st., Hulme	manufacturer	30	1,500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for William Marsden.	Cheetham, Manchester.	agent -	30	1,500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Joseph Maguire.	St. John-st., Manchester.	agent -	100	5,000	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for John Whittaker.	Cheetham, Manchester.	engraver -	50	2,500	—	
3d June 1836.						
Edward Watson Ellis -	26, Mortimer-street.	gentleman -	40	2,000	—	
13th June 1836.						
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Maria Treherne.	Cheltenham - -	widow -	5	250	—	

(continued)

City Railway.

Appendix, No. 14.

CHRISTIAN AND SURNAME.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Profession or Calling.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.	(L. S.)	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for William Hunter.	Cheltenham - -	esquire -	50	2,500	—	W. Gethen.
Fra. Beetham, attorney for George Smith.	5, Tontine-quay, Bristol.	wharfinger -	30	1,500	—	W. Gethen.
13th June 1836.						
Robert Brine - -	Camden-hill-villa, Kensington.	wine merchant	10	500	—	C. Woolcot.
James M'Namara -	51, York-st., Dublin	gentleman -	30	1,500	—	Fras. Beetham.
William Fawcett -	Salisbury - -	esquire -	20	1,000	—	W. Gethen.
Francis Place - -	110, Cheapside -	warehouseman	5	250	—	W. Gethen.
James West - -	7, Clayton-pl. Kennington.	appraiser -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Horatio B. Lonsdale -	9, New Broad-st. -	gentleman -	10	500	—	J. Binns.
John Spurgin - -	38, Guildford-st. -	physician -	10	500	—	J. Binns.
Charles Brand - -	Bath Canal-office -	Lieut., R. N.	40	2,000	—	Fra. Beetham.
22 July 1836:						
Fran. Beetham, attorney for Jas. Fiender.	York - - -	gentleman -	100	5,000	—	W. Gethen.
Fran. Beetham, attorney for Isaac Altham.	Dalby, near York	clerk - -	5	250	—	W. Gethen.
Francis Beetham, attorney for Chris. John Newstead.	York - - -	attorney at law	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Fran. Beetham, attorney for John Noble.	York - - -	under gardener.	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Francis Beetham, attorney for Jabez Punderson.	York - - -	gentleman -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Fran. Beetham, attorney for Wm. Bolton.	Whitby - -	draper -	5	250	—	W. Gethen.
Francis Beetham, attorney for Thomas Andrew.	York - - -	yeoman -	2	100	—	W. Gethen.
Fran. Beetham, attorney for Wm. Smith.	York - - -	gentleman -	5	250	—	W. Gethen.
Fran. Beetham, attorney for M. H. Miller.	Scarborough -	clerk -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Wm. R. Chamberlain	21, Surrey-grove, Kent-road.	agent -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Edward Ryan - -	George-st., Dublin	barrister at law	11	550	—	Fra. Beetham.
W. Baker - -	Auction Mart -	patten-maker	40	2,000	—	Fra. Beetham.
Ernest Wolff, as attorney for Martin Wolff, of Hamburgh.	3, Copthall-buildings, London.	painter -	50	2,500	—	W. Gethen.
Augustus Bohté -	9, Sackville-street, Piccadilly.	clothier -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Geo. Edw. Gustard -	1, Lancaster-place, Strand.	solicitor -	20	1,000	—	W. Gethen.
William Dorrington -	Auction-mart Coffee-house.	agent -	60	3,000	—	W. Gethen.
Charles Smith - -	5, Walworth Villa	clerk - -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Thomas Keating -	St. Paul's Ch.-yard	druggist -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
William Constantine -	18, John-st. Holywell-mount.	tailor - -	5	250	—	W. Gethen.
Charles Harriss, for Messrs. Butler and Harriss.	49, Finsbury-square	gentlemen -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
James Crook - -	45, Skinner-street	auctioneer -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
Thomas Moody - -	104, Fore-street -	warehouseman	6	300	—	W. Gethen.
Edmund Westby -	37, Threadneedle-street.	merchant -	20	1,000	—	W. Gethen.
Alfred Newman -	78, Jermyn-street -	merchant -	5	250	—	W. Gethen.
M. & E. Levin - -	Jewry-street, City	merchants -	10	500	—	W. Gethen.
John Cogswell - -	4, Chandos-buildings, Bath.	bookseller -	5	250	—	W. Gethen.
Robt. Henry Skinner	5, King's-mead-sq., Bath.	chemist -	10	500	—	Fra. Beetham.
Francis Thomas Allen	Hanover-house, Bath.	gentleman -	10	500	—	Fra. Beetham.
William Edwards -	12, Cleaveland-pl., Bath.	carpenter -	5	250	—	Fra. Beetham.
Horace Moger - -	Bathwick-hill, Bath	gentleman -	30	1,500	—	Fra. Beetham.
William Hutchins -	Winifred-house -	clerk - -	15	750	—	Fra. Beetham.

CHRISTIAN AND SURNAME.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Profession or Calling.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
					(L. S.)	
Robert Ashman -	Devonshire-buildings, Bath.	esquire -	10	500	—	Fra. Beetham.
George Wigens - -	7, Princes-st., Bath	accountant -	10	500	—	
Charles Wilkinson -	Custom-house -	gentleman -	10	500	—	
John Arnett - -	ditto - -	gentleman -	10	500	—	
George Crucknell -	5, Watling-street -	merchant -	20	1,000	—	
John Bright - -	60, Mark-lane -	gentleman -	5	250	—	
W. Burnett - -	Park-street - -	gentleman -	15	750	—	
Robert Bird - -	141, Long-acre -	silversmith	10	500	—	
James M'Carthy -	18, Beaumont-sq. -	wine merchant	50	2,500	—	
William E. East -	1, St. Dunstan's-hill	printer -	20	1,000	—	
George Wilson - -	131, Chancery-lane	button-manuf.	15	750	—	
Thomas Colbatch -	Leek, Staffordshire	gentleman -	100	5,000	—	
Arthur Willis - -	1, Newgate-street -	printer -	20	1,000	—	
Edward W. Williams, for Lady Florentia Eliz. Nightingale.	69, York-place -	widow -	20	1,000	—	
Ebenezer Fernie -	Lordship's Hall, Tottenham.	esquire -	40	2,000	—	W. Gethen.
Edward Hughes -	Albany - -	gentleman -	15	750	—	
Henry Clayton - -	Excise-office, London.	exciseman -	5	250	—	
Francis Beetham, attorney for William Milner.	Liverpool - -	manufacturer	20	1,000	—	
William Hedges -	18, Charles-st., St. James's, London.	wax-chandler	20	1,000	—	
Archibald C. Dennistown.	14, Circus, Edinburgh.	esquire -	10	500	—	
Janse Hill - -	7, North-side, Cambridge-road.	esquire -	10	500	—	
John Symes - - -	1, Hatton-wall -	victualler -	20	1,000	—	
John T. Drake - -	8, Peckham-grove	clerk - -	10	500	—	
Charles Robinson -	18, Bartholomew-pl. Kingsland-road.	clerk - -	5	250	—	C. Woolcott.
W. Wilkinson - -	Custom-house -	gentleman -	10	500	—	
Thomas Bailey Rose -	28, Essex-street -	barrister at law	5	250	—	
Thomas Somers -	Putney - -	gentleman -	15	750	—	
Fran. Beetham, attorney for Chas. Wightman.	Newcastle-upon-Tyne.	doct. of physic	100	5,000	—	
Fran. Beetham, attorney for Joseph Price.	Gateshead - -	gentleman -	100	5,000	—	W. Gethen
Francis Beetham, attorney for Hormanio Schwabe.	Glasgow - -	merchant -	8	400	—	
William Dalton -	Little Abingdon-street, Lambeth.	coal-merchant	12	600	—	
Felix Blunt - -	84, Hercules-build.	architect -	50	2,500	—	Fra. Beetham.
Henry Wm. Busk -	4, New-sq. Lin.-Inn	esquire -	10	500	—	
19 October 1836:						
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Richard Keiley.	Cleveland-row -	gentleman -	10	500	—	
20 October 1836:						
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Wm. Howard.	Leeds - - -	merchant -	50	2,500	—	W. Gethen.
Fra. Beetham, attorney for W. N. Nicholson.	Roundhay, near Leeds.	esquire -	40	2,000	—	
Charles Gould - -	67, King-st. Golden-square.	clerk -	10	500	—	
Jacob Nunes Castello	11, Beaumont-st., Mile-end.	share-agent	20	1,000	—	
10 November 1836:						
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Hen. Pope, jun.	Manchester - -	merchant -	15	750	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Spencer Beckham.	ditto - -	merchant -	10	500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Tho. Harbottle.	ditto - -	spinner and manuf.	50	2,500	—	C. Woolcott.
Fra. Beetham, attorney for John Cropp.	ditto - -	calico-printer	10	500	—	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Geo. Doncaster.	15, Great George-street, Liverpool.	merchant -	15	750	—	

(*continued*)

City Railway.

Appendix, No. 14.

CHRISTIAN AND SURNAME.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Profession or Calling.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.	(L. S.)	
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Thos. Burgess.	Manchester - -	merchant -	15	750	—	C. Woolcott.
Fra. Beetham, attorney for John Harrison.	ditto - -	gentleman -	20	1,000	—	
Samuel Carr - -	Upper Charles-st. Northampton-sq.	gentleman	90	4,500	—	W. Gethen.
Charles Blunt - -	Dartford, Kent -	engineer -	38	1,900	—	
William Penrer -	Cheltenham -	banker -	20	1,000	—	C. Woolcott.
Henry Sibley - -	Gray's Inn-square	gentleman -	50	2,500	—	W. Gethen.
Joshua Brandon -	2, Walbrook-build.	merchant -	30	1,500	—	
Richard Watkins -	180, Regent-street	merchant -	30	1,500	—	J. F. Mould.
William Cooke -	8, Capel-court -	gentleman	60	3,000	—	Fra. Beetham.
Fra. Beetham, attorney for John Palin.	Chester - -	grocer -	20	1,000	—	J. F. Mould.
Fra. Beetham, attorney for Henry Nicholls Jones.	Chester - -	dentist -	10	500	—	J. F. Mould.
Fra. Beetham, attorney for John Ashton.	11, Crown-street, Finsbury.	hosier -	25	1,250	—	
Henry Laxton - -	4, Manchester-buildings, Westminster.	architect -	50	2,500	—	Fra. Beetham.
Henry Daniel Martin	East India Dock-ho. Leadenhall-street.	engineer -	50	2,500	—	
James Macnamara -	Dublin - -	esquire -	170	8,500	—	
Charles Blunt - -	Dartford, Kent -	engineer -	62	3,100	—	W. Gethen.
Henry Miller - -	Rahere-st., Goswell-road.	architect -	30	1,500	—	Fra. Betham.
Henry Beetham -	Conduit-street -	architect -	50	2,500	—	
Chas. Theodore Verbike	Priory, Battersea -	gentleman -	250	12,500	—	Edw. Beetham.
W. J. Northouse -	9, Parliament-street	gentleman -	50	2,500	—	
Henry Holland - -	4, Duke-st., Adelphi	architect -	30	1,500	—	
A. W. Beetham -	Tulse-hill - -	barrister-at-law.	30	1,500	—	
Frederick Polhill -	Howbery-hall, Beds.	esquire -	30	1,500	—	
Richard Cooke - -	Kentish-town -	esquire -	30	1,500	—	
John Henry Walker -	23, Charlotte-street, Bloomsbury.	surgeon -	30	1,500	—	Fra. Beetham.
James Cathrow Disney	Belmont Lodge -	esquire -	30	1,500	—	
H. C. Dakeyne -	14, Hamilton-ter., St. John's-wood.	esquire -	30	1,500	—	
William Price - -	Woodhatch, Rygate	esquire -	10	500	—	
George Bain - -	2, Parliament-street	gentleman -	50	2,500	—	
Thomas S. Goode -	Ironmonger-lane -	esquire -	30	1,500	—	
Thomas Arnold -	15, Denmark-street	grocer -	30	1,500	—	
George Harris - -	12, Aberdeen-place, Maida-hill.	architect -	75	3,550	—	W. Gethen.
John Hurle - -	17, Rahere-street -	architect -	75	3,550	—	
William Blofield -	19, Hosier-lane -	builder -	36	1,800	—	Fra. Beetham.
			8,751	437,550		

A true copy of the Subscription Contract,

3 February 1837. *W. Gethen*, Under-Secretary.

Appendix, No. 15.

The City of London (or Southwark and Hammersmith) Railway.

Appendix, No. 15. Number of Applicants for Shares.

	Applicants.	Number of Shares applied for.	Number of Shares Allotted.
Number of applicants and to whom shares were allotted - - - - - - - - -	889	23,153	17,051
Number of applicants for shares (considered *bad*) to whom none were allotted. - - - - - -	165	4,602	—
	1,054	27,755	17,051

Appendix, No. 16.

Affidavit of Mr. *Charles Ball.*

Appendix, No. 16. Affidavit of Mr. Charles Ball.

Charles Ball, of Wilton-street, in the county of Middlesex, gentleman, aged thirty years and upwards, doth declare and say, that he was present in the committee-room of the House of Commons on Thursday the 4th day of May instant, when Charles John Blunt was examined before the Committee on the Dover and Deptford Railway, and stated that he booked himself or went as an inside passenger by a night-coach or a mail to Coventry, on Saturday night last, from the coach-office of the Swan with Two Necks, Lad-lane: and this declarant saith, that the only coach-office in Lad-lane is the coach-office at the Swan with Two Necks, and that the only night-coaches from that office on Saturday night last, to or through Coventry, was as follows; namely, the Greyhound night-coach, which had four inside passengers booked, three of whom were to Liverpool, and one to Chester; and that none of such passengers were booked in the name of Blunt. Saith the Holyhead mail had also four insides booked; one to Capel Cerig, one a Mr. Haynes, to Birmingham, and two to Shifnall; and that none of these were booked in the name of Blunt. Saith that the Liverpool mail had also four insides booked at the said office, three of whom were to Liverpool, and one to Stone; and that none of those passengers were booked in the name of Blunt. That these were the only coaches despatched from the said office on Saturday night the 29th of April last, being the night the said Charles John Blunt stated to the Committee he went to Coventry by a coach from the said office.

* * * * * * * *

And I make this declaration at the instance and request of the promoters of a Bill now before Parliament.

Taken and acknowledged before me this 6th day of May 1837.

Charles Ball.

J. P. Burrell,
Magistrate for Westminster.

FOURTH REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

RAILWAY SUBSCRIPTION LISTS;

TOGETHER WITH THE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

South Midland Counties Railway.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
10 *July* 1837.

Mercurii, 22° die Februarii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the matters of several Petitions, complaining of the Names of certain needy and indigent Persons having been inserted in the Subscription Lists of several Railways, and praying for Inquiry into the Case of the Deptford and Dover Railway Subscription List; and to whom several Petitions containing similar allegations were particularly referred.

Martis, 1° die Martii, 1837.

A Committee was nominated of,—

Mr. Warburton.
Mr. Dugdale.
Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Aaron Chapman.
Mr. Charles Lushington.
Sir Eardley Wilmot.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. John Young.
Mr. Daniel Gaskell.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. George Evans.

Ordered, THAT the said Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers and Records

Ordered, THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Mercurii, 19° die Aprilis, 1837.

Order [1st March] that Five be the Quorum of the Committee, read, and discharged.

Ordered, THAT Three be the Quorum of the said Committee.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to report their Opinion, together with the Minutes of the Evidence taken before them, from time to time, to The House.

Veneris, 21° die Aprilis, 1837.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Dugdale, Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. John Young and Mr. George Evans be discharged from further attendance; and that Mr. Chalmers be added to the Committee.

THE REPORT - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - p. 1
APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - p. 117

FOURTH REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE to whom have been referred sundry Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contracts of certain Railway Companies, and, among these, the following Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contract of the South Midland Counties Railway Company; viz.

1st. That of Richard Spencer, of Baldwin-street, City-road, Labourer, and John Spear, of Clerkenwell-green, Merchant's Clerk, stating that they were induced to sign the Parliamentary Contract List of the said Company from pecuniary and other circumstances; that they were at the time they signed the Deed, and still are, in an indigent state, and would, if called upon, be totally unable to fulfil the Contract entered into by them; that they have signed other Parliamentary Deeds to the amount of many thousand pounds, and have received various pecuniary considerations for so doing; and that they have described themselves differently in the various Deeds signed by them; and praying that their Petition may be referred to a Select Committee, in order that the allegations therein contained may be inquired into; and,

2dly. That of Sir Henry Halford, of Wistow Hall, in the county of Lancaster, Bart., alleging, amongst other things, that application has been made at the places of abode of many of those who have signed the Parliamentary Deed, some of whom cannot be found, and others having left the residences named by them in the said Deeds, cannot now be met with; that many of the Persons named in a list contained in the said Petition, are not of the calling therein described; that most of the said Persons are in very indigent circumstances; that many of them were induced to sign the said Deed without being Shareholders, and have not paid any deposit on the Shares set opposite to their names; that their names are attached to other subscription lists, and that they would not, if called upon, be able to fulfil the contracts entered into by them; that several other of the Subscribers are Persons of insufficient means; and praying that the matters aforesaid may be referred to a Select Committee, and that the Petitioner may be heard by himself, his counsel, agents and witnesses, on the matters aforesaid:

And who were empowered to report their Observations, together with the MINUTES OF EVIDENCE taken before them, from time to time, to The House;——HAVE taken Evidence on the Matters adverted to in the said Petitions, or having reference thereto, and have heard the observations made on such Evidence by the Agent for the

 Petitioner,

Petitioner, in the Petition second above mentioned, and by the Counsel of the South Midland Counties Railway Company; and after considering the whole of the premises, have agreed to the following REPORT:

THE project for the formation of a Company to obtain an Act for making a Line of Railway, to be called the South Midland Railway, from the Midland Counties Railway at Leicester, through Harborough and Northampton, to the London and Birmingham Railway at or near Blisworth, with a branch from Harborough to Stamford, was set on foot in the beginning of the year 1836. At a meeting of the parties interested in this undertaking, held at Market Harborough on the 1st of March 1836, it was resolved that a Company, for the purpose of carrying this project into effect, should then be formed, and a provisional committee was appointed to prepare a Prospectus, to draw up rules for the regulation of the Company, and to take such other preliminary proceedings as they might think necessary.

15664 to 15731.

To this committee power also was given to oppose in Parliament the Midland Counties Railway Company, in respect of their Line from Leicester to Rugby, to negociate with that Company for their abandoning that Line, and adopting the proposed Line of the South Midland Railway Company; and, in case of success in that negociation, to dissolve the proposed South Midland Railway Company.

In the first Prospectus issued by this committee, the capital required for the undertaking was estimated at 1,200,000 *l.* to be raised in 24,000 shares of 50 *l.* each; the deposit to be 1 *l.* per share, with a condition that no further call should be made until one-half of the capital was subscribed: and the further power of making calls was limited in the Subscriber's agreement, until after an Act of Parliament was obtained, to the further sum of 1 *l.* per share. A second call of 1 *l.* per share was made on the 13th of February in the present year; but this call was reduced to 10 *s.* on the 20th of April in the present year, at which time it was resolved to suspend further proceedings during the present Session with the Bill in Parliament.

13168, 13169.

The estimate of 1,200,000 *l.* is stated to be the result of a detailed investigation of the quantity and cost of the works required for the proposed undertaking, made by Mr. Giles, the engineer, who gave evidence in support of his plans and estimate before the Committee on the Midland Counties Railway in 1836. That estimate, with some corrections, forms the foundation of the present estimate.

13004 to 13010.

In an advertisement inserted in the Times newspaper, and other London newspapers, on the 4th of April 1836, and on some preceding days, announcing as Bankers to the Company:

For Northampton	- -	Messrs. T. & S. Percival,
Market Harborough,		Messrs. Inkersole & Goddards,
Stamford	- - -	Messrs. Eaton & Co., and the Joint Stock Bank,
Leicester	- - -	Messrs. Paget & Kirby,
London	- - - -	Sir James Esdaile & Co.;

and as Solicitors to the Company:

For Northampton	- -	W. Scriven, Esq.,
Market Harborough,		Messrs. Douglas & Abbey,
Stamford	- - -	Messrs. Torkington.

applications

applications for shares were directed to be made to any of the Bankers or Solicitors above mentioned, or to the Secretary, until Wednesday the 6th of April; and a respectable reference was directed to be given by the applicants at the time of their applying for shares.

To the London applicants allotments of shares were made by the Directors at their different meetings prior to the 13th of April. In the country, after the meeting of the 1st of March, the bankers named at that meeting had authority to allot shares to, and receive deposits from applicants in their immediate neighbourhood, according to their discretion: it appears, however, from letters of application produced in evidence, that they also allotted shares to parties residing in London. Also three stockbrokers, one at Liverpool, another at Manchester and another at Leeds, were authorized to allot 2,000 shares each among applicants for shares at those towns respectively. 15664. 13043, 13044. 15664. 15817. 15664.

On the meeting of the committee in London, on or about the 13th of April, lists being laid before them of the persons who had paid deposits in the country, it was discovered that some were parties of doubtful pecuniary responsibility; and a resolution was passed that the shares on which deposits had been actually paid, should be allotted to those by whom they had been paid; but letters were ordered to be written to the bankers and stockbrokers in the country, directing them not to allot any more shares, or receive any more deposits; and a circular was addressed to the London applicants, informing them that no more shares would at that time be allotted. Three Directors were appointed a committee, to make a selection from among the applicants of the persons to whom further allotments should be made; but the committee never acted under this appointment. Mr. Lawson, of Bush-lane, was employed to investigate the list of applicants, and Mr. Erck, who had been for 28 years a clerk in the house of Esdailes, the bankers of the Company, was applied to by the Directors to give his opinion on the character of the applicants; an opinion which he formed from an examination of the letters themselves. The names of the applicants were classed under the heads of good, bad and indifferent; to some of them no shares were allotted, and no new allotments were made until after the 1st of November 1836. 13045, 13046. 13104. 15664. 15664. 15667. 15666. 13776. 13777. 13787. 13802.

On the 21st of April 1836 it was announced by public advertisement, that in consequence of the applications for shares far exceeding the amount of capital required, and many of them being from landowners on the Line of the proposed Railway, the committee were obliged to decline for the present to allot any more shares; that the Subscribers' Agreement and Parliamentary Contract would remain for signature at the committee-room from Monday the 25th until Saturday the 30th instant, during which time, at the usual hours of business, scrip-certificates of shares would be exchanged for bankers' receipts, and that, for reasons stated in the advertisement, it was desirable to have the Parliamentary deeds executed with as little delay as possible. Standard newspaper, 21 April 1836. 15711.

Many of those who came to exchange bankers' receipts for scrip-certificates and to sign the deed, not proving to be original allottees of shares, were not permitted, in the first instance, by the secretary to make the exchange and to sign. A difficulty, however, occurred in enforcing this regulation; for the receipts did not specify what the names of the depositors were to whom the receipts produced had originally been given. The bearers represented that they had bought these receipts in the open market; that if the Directors persisted 13100. 13102. 15711. 15731.

persisted in refusing to allow them to sign, they would have no redress, since, in consequence of the name of the depositors not being entered in the receipts, they would not be able to trace who the depositors were; and further, that it was usual, in other Companies, to allow to the bearers of bankers' receipts the same rights which would have been enjoyed by the original allottees of shares. Hereupon, the Directors, considering that by neglecting to direct the bankers to insert in the receipts the several depositors' names, they themselves had occasioned the existing difficulty, instructed their secretary to allow every person that brought a receipt, to sign the deed.

13102.
13133 to 13139.
15728.

Shares.	£.	
41,730, amounting in money to	2,086,500, were applied for by	1,256 London applicants.
12,000, amounting in money to	600,000, were allotted to and paid upon by about	600 country applicants.
Total, 53,730, amounting in money to	£. 2,686,500, were applied for by	1,856 applicants.

18,914, amounting in money to	945,700, were allotted to -	968 persons.
13,058, amounting in money to	652,900, were paid upon, at the rate of 1 *l.* per share, by - -	738 depositors.
12,124, amounting in money to	606,200, have been subscrib[d] for in the Parliamentary contract by - - -	607 subscribers.
	of whom	561 are origin[l] allottees.
		46 are transferrees of bankers' receipts.
		607

The consequence of allowing the bearers of bankers' receipts, without inquiring who they were, to become subscribers to the deed, has been what might have been anticipated; that many persons of insufficient pecuniary responsibility, (and who on that very account, when employed to sign for other parties, were considered as the fitter instruments for that purpose,) have become subscribers to the deed. The names of all those parties, whom Your Committee are disposed to regard as not *bonâ fide* subscribers, they have inserted in a Table, with the amounts of their respective subscriptions against their names, stating on what grounds objection lies to them as subscribers; whether, 1. That they have signed the deed for other parties without stating that fact upon the deed itself: 2. That they have signed the deed for others, who have paid them a pecuniary compensation for so doing: 3. That they are unable to meet the payments of the instalments on their several subscriptions, whether by reason of embarrassed circumstances, insolvency, abject poverty, or general insufficiency of means to meet the payments as they may arise: 4. That their place of abode, as stated against their names in the Subscription Contract, is fictitious; or if not fictitious, that they have quitted it, and cannot now be found: 5. That they were minors when they signed: 6. That they applied to the Directors for shares, but had not any allotted to them: 7. That they signed other deeds for a pecuniary compensation.

		Subscribed on behalf of Another.	For a Pecuniary Compensation, or promise thereof.	In embarrassed Circumstances, or, too Poor to pay.	Residence unknown.	Application for Shares refused.	Minors.	Signed other Deeds for Money.	Number of Shares.	Amount in Money
										£.
13235 to 13256	John Henry Morgan	—	—	—	- -	- -	- -	—	30	1,500
13661 to 13740	Richard Richards	—	—	—	- -	- -	- -	—	40	2,000
13940 to 13954 14046 to 14056	John Edward Stokes	—	—	—	- -	- -	- -	—	80	4,000
13841	Alexander Gompertz	—	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	40	2,000
14139 to 14178	John Spear	—	—	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	20	1,000
14183 to 14245	Richard Spencer	—	—	—	- -	- -	- -	—	15	750
14523 to 14566 14012 to 14118	Wm. Burnett Bloxam	—	—	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	140	7,000
14692, 14693	Frederick Edw. Ellis	—	—	—	- -	- -	—	- -	110	5,500
15035 to 15113	George Saunders	—	—	—	- -	—	- -	- -	130	6,500
14978 to 14990	John Layland	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	—	- -	50	2,500
15818 to 15856	James Edwards	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	—	- -	30	1,500
14036 15310	W. A. L. Piercy	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	—	30	1,500
14355 to 14357 14034 to 14345	William Cooke	—	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	30	1,500
14425 to 14469 15317	Archibald Kerr	—	- -	—	- -	—	- -	Signed the City Rail way Deed for the same party.	55	2,755
15810	William Hall	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	50	2,500
14394 to 14424	John Haley	- -	- -	—	- -	—	- -	—	20	1,000
15496 to 15499 15503	G. R. Modley	- -	- -	—	—	- -	- -	- -	30	1,500
14720	Edward Watson Ellis	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	110	5,500
15159 to 15171	Joseph Zenetti	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	30	1,500
15172	John Clark	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	10	500
15230 to 15255	James Stringer	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	5	250
15318 to 15324	R. Blakemore	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	70	3,500
15365 to 15491	G. A. Broad	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	—	120	6,000
15504 to 15530	Charles Moring	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	50	2,500
15531 to 15537	William Taylor	- -	- -	—	- -	—	- -	- -	80	4,000
13515	C. R. Johnson	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	20	1,000
13993 16047	W. Bamfield	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	40	2,000
13998 15335 to 15357	Francisco Amadio	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	50	2,500
14004 14874 14931 14934	John Jackson	- -	- -	—	- -	- -	- -	—	310	15,500
15308, 15309	Joseph Dandridge	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	30	1,500
14014 15496 16027	R. Brine	- -	- -	—	—	- -	- -	- -	150	7,500

		Subscribed on behalf of Another.	For a Pecuniary Compensation, or promise thereof.	In embarrassed Circumstances, or, too Poor to pay.	Residence unknown.	Application for Shares refused.	Minors.	Signed other Deeds for Money.	Number of Shares.	Amount in Money.
										£.
14017, 15434 to 15441, 15663	Charles Fraser	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	1,000
14023, 15256 to 15307	G. E. Beckers	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	50	2,500
14039, 16023	Benjamin Day	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30	1,500
15000 to 15023	George W. Morrison	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	210	10,500
13335, 15410	William Wright	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	270	17,500
15456	Vernon Prankard	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	1,000
15573	William Hamilton	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	100	5,000
13385	Charles Williams	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	70	3,500
13573	Richard Fitzroy Holderness.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	50	2,500
13614	John Smith	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	500
15807	William Pitfield	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	60	3,000
13596	A. Austen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	60	3,000
14858	John Euston	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	500
15402	John Read	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	100	5,000
15432	William Redgrave	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	1,000
15472	Charles Griffith	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	60	3,000
15779	William White	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	1,000
15488	George Robinson	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30	1,500
	TOTAL								3,165	158,150

The names of many of these parties appear in the other Subscription Lists referred to the investigation of Your Committee; but on this circumstance they will defer remarking until the presentation of their final Report.

Your Committee will now advert to such of the cases included in the foregoing list, as appear to them to require particular notice; and, first, there is a class to which John Henry Morgan, Richard Rickards, John Spear, Richard Spencer, William Burnett Bloxam, James Edwards and John Edward Stokes belong, all of whom have signed the deed for other parties, those parties being brokers or jobbers in the stock and share market, who have paid to the above-named individuals a pecuniary compensation for signing.

13235. 13262. John Henry Morgan signed for 30 shares, 1,500*l.*, on behalf of Mr. Kelly, a share-jobber, who paid him a sovereign for so doing. To sign for other
13252. parties was the common practice. He was induced to sign the Westminster
13242. Bridge and Deptford Railway Deed for the payment of 10*s.* He is exceedingly poor.

13661. Richard Rickards, carpenter, signed for 40 shares, 2,000*l.*, on behalf of
13662. 13665. Mr. Alexander Young, of the Stock Exchange, who paid him a sovereign for
13740. so doing. He was induced to sign the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway Deed for the payment of 10*s.* He would be unable, if required, to
13674. pay the deposit on the shares he has signed for.

14139. 14142. John Spear was employed by Mr. Robson, stockbroker, of the Stock
14168. 14175. Exchange, to sign for 35 shares, 1,750*l.* On his presenting the banker's receipts, and applying to sign for that number of shares, the secretary said he must consult the Directors; and afterwards advised Spear to find some friend to sign for 15 of the shares. This Spear did, and was then allowed to sign for 20 shares, 1,000*l.* Mr. Robson paid him at sundry times 20*s.* for so doing.

doing. Spear admits that he is not in a situation to pay the call of 10*s.* a share on the 20 shares he has signed for. 14149, 14150, 14151. 14159.

Richard Spencer, who is a jobber in shares, was the person employed by John Spear to sign for the 15 shares, 750*l.*, belonging to Mr. Robson, for which Spear was not permitted to sign. Spencer received 5*s.* in Mr. Robson's office from John Williams, a clerk in that office, for signing. He signed the deeds of the Kent Railway Company, for the sum of 4*s.*; and of the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway Company for the sum of 10*s.* He would be unable, if required so to do, to pay the instalment of 10*s.* a share on the shares he has signed for. Spear and Spencer attended at the office of the Company, and signed the deed at the same time. From the dress of Spencer on that occasion, the secretary must have been aware that he was then in great difficulties. 14178. 14198, 14199. 14201. 14238. 14244, 14245.

William Burnett Bloxam, who has been a stock-jobber, and was a defaulter in 1832 or 1833; and is now a horse-dealer and owner of cabriolets, signed for 140 shares, 7,000*l.* Of these 20 shares were allotted to him. He applied for 25 more shares, which application was not granted. For 120 of the shares for which he appears as a subscriber, he signed on behalf of Mr. Northover, a member of the Stock Exchange, and received 20*s.* from him for so doing. He is unable to pay the call of 10*s.* on 140 shares. He has signed the City Railway Deed under two different names. 14524. 14560. 14529. 14567 to 14570. 14532. 14559. *Vide* 3d Rep. of this Committee, p. 6.

James Edwards is a clerk to Mr. Charles Moxon, of 9, Broad-street, share-broker, and was a minor when he signed the deed. He signed for 30 shares, 1,500*l.*, at the request and on the behalf of Mr. Moxon, who, on Edwards's hesitating to do so, observed, that as Edwards was under age, his signing would not be of the slightest consequence. 15818. 15833. 15834. 15856.

John Edward Stokes, who is a broker for stock and shares, and who has lately been a defaulter, (but has not taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act, as was erroneously stated in the Third Report of this Committee,) signed for 80 shares, 4,000*l.*; he has signed for his principals, and not on his own account. Who his principals are he has not stated. He has nearly 100 principals for whom he is in the habit of signing Railway deeds, which business he transacts at a commission of from 1*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* a share. Many other stockbrokers do the like. If the shares fall to a discount, the principals put their scrip into the fire, and pay no instalments. Mr. Stokes signed the following Railway deeds for the sums severally hereunder stated, on account of principals, who paid him a commission for so doing; viz. 9418. 13940. 13951. 14047. 13046. 13954. 14051.

	£.
The Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway deed -	750
The City Railway deed - - - - - -	1,500
Gibbs's London and Brighton Railway deed - - -	3,400
The Bristol and Exeter - - - - - -	2,000

14954.

Mr. Robert Johnson, a member of the Stock Exchange and a stockbroker, who was called as a witness before the Committee, stated that he had paid money to other parties to induce them to sign for shares belonging to him in various Companies, in order that responsibility might be removed from his own shoulders. 14991 to 15032.

The only other case included in the preceding list, which the Committee consider it necessary particularly to notice, is that of Frederick Edward Ellis, a clerk in the Admiralty Office, at a salary of 90*l.* a year, and a minor, 16 14616. 14619. 14649.

14612. 14622. years old, who has subscribed for 110 shares, 5,500 *l.*, and both in applying for shares and in subscribing the deed, signed his name as Edward Ellis. He 14628. 14656. wrote the letter of application in the presence and at the instance of his 14641. 14722. cousin, Edward Watson Ellis, aged 24, who is also a subscriber to the deed for 14692, 14693. 110 shares, 5,500 *l.*, and is an attorney not in practice. His cousin promised 14831 him 5 *l.* for signing the deed, but has not paid him. Frederick Edward Ellis is quite unable to pay the call of 10 *s.* per share on the amount he has sub- 14702. scribed for. He was rather afraid to sign; but his cousin told him there was nothing in it, that in a year or two a letter would come to his lodgings, and then he would have nothing to do but to leave them.

The estimated amount of the undertaking, it has been already stated, is 1,200,000 *l.*, the moiety of which required by the Standing Orders to be subscribed is 600,000 *l.* The amount actually subscribed to the deed is 606,200 *l.*, from which deducting the amount of 158,150 *l.*, which do not appear to Your Committee to be *bonâ fide* subscriptions, there will remain the amount of 448,050 *l.*, which is deficient by 151,950 *l.* of the sum required by the Standing Orders to be subscribed. The Bill, as Your Committee have already remarked, has been withdrawn for the present Session.

10 *July* 1837.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Lunæ, 3° die Julii, 1837.

PRESENT,

MR. WARBURTON, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. Forster.
Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. Lushington.

Report read, considered, and agreed to.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Veneris, 5° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. James Ley Douglas - - - - - p. 1
Mr. John Gustard - - - - - - p. 11
Mr. John Henry Morgan - - - - - p. 14
Mr. William Winkworth - - - - - p. 17
Stopford Jones - - - - - - - p. 27

Sabbati, 6° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Richard Rickards - - - - - p. 27
Mr. William Augustus Erck - - - - p. 30
Mr. Alexander Gompertz - - - - - p. 34
Mr. Frederick King - - - - - - p. 36
Mr. John Edward Stokes - - - - - p. 37
John Spear - - - - - - - p. 43
Richard Spencer - - - - - - - p. 45
Mary Wadham - - - - - - - p. 47
Mr. Stopford Jones - - - - - - p. 48
William Cooke - - - - - - - p. 50
John Haley - - - - - - - p. 51
Archibald Kerr - - - - - - - p. 53

Lunæ, 8° die Maii, 1837.

John Pocock - - - - - - - p. 55
Mr. William Burnett Bloxam - - - - p. 56
Mr. Frederick Edward Ellis - - - - p. 59
Mr. James Richardson - - - - - p. 66
Mr. John Jackson - - - - - - p. 66
Mr. Robert Johnson - - - - - - p. 71
Mr. George Saunders - - - - - - p. 72
Mr. William Evans Hutchinson - - - - p. 76
Mr. Thomas Green - - - - - - p. 79
Mr. John Gustard - - - - - - p. 82
Mr. James Henderson - - - - - p. 86
Mr. Thomas Harrison - - - - - - p. 86

Martis, 9° die Maii, 1837.

Thomas Green - - - - - - - p. 87
Mr. William Gifford - - - - - - p. 95
Mr. Daniel Edward Stephens - - - - p. 99
James Edwards - - - - - - - p. 102
Mr. Henry Allanson - - - - - - p. 104
Benjamin Day - - - - - - - p. 107
Otto Penn - - - - - - - - p. 108
Mr. William Winkworth - - - - - p. 109

Jovis, 18° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Walter George Head - - - - - p. 110
Richard Spencer - - - - - - p. 111
Mr. Frederick Vane - - - - - - p. 112

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Veneris, 5° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

SOUTH MIDLAND RAILWAY.

THE *Chairman* inquired whether a table had been made out containing references to the evidence of witnesses examined with regard to other companies, whose evidence was intended to be relied upon in this case.

Mr. *Vane* stated that it had been prepared and delivered to the parties on the other side.

Mr. *Bere* stated he had no objection to the evidence in chief being taken in the way proposed; but the witnesses must be produced, in order that he might have an opportunity of cross-examining them.

The *Chairman* stated that Mr. Bere had a right to cross-examine the witnesses, or such of them as he thought necessary.

Mr. *Bere* stated he should have to ask all the witnesses now alluded to a few questions.

The Petition of Richard Spencer and John Spear was read.

The Petition of Sir Henry Halford, bart., was read.

Mr. *Vane* appeared in support of the Petition of Sir Henry Halford.

Mr. *Bere* appeared on behalf of the South Midland Company.

Mr. *Vane* shortly stated to the Committee the course he meant to pursue with respect to the witnesses he should call.

Mr. *James Ley Douglas*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *J. L. Douglas*.

5 May 1837.

12902. Mr. *Vane.*] I BELIEVE you are solicitor to the South Midland Counties Railway?—I am.

12903. How long have you been so?—I have been one of the joint solicitors with Messrs. Forkington, of Stamford, and Messrs. Scriven, of Northampton, since the first formation of the company.

12904. How long have you been sole solicitor?—I can tell from reference to the minute book; I should think since about last August; it is somewhere about that time.

12905. Will you be kind enough to state to the Committee the way in which this company originated?—Public meetings were held at Northampton, Stamford and Harborough, in the months of January and February in 1836. A public meeting of the proprietors and occupiers of land on the line, and others interested on the line, was called the 1st of March 1836, at Market Harborough; it was called by advertisement. At that meeting the Rev. Sir George Robinson, bart., was called to the chair, on the motion of Sir Arthur Brooke, bart. This is a copy of the resolution as entered into at that meeting.

12906. *Chairman.*] State any particular point in the resolutions?—

Mr. *Vane.*] I wish to ascertain whether it was not established for the purpose of another competing line of railway then before Parliament?—

Witness.] Certainly one of the objects of the company was to oppose that company, and it was one of the resolutions entered into, that this company should be authorized to oppose that company.

12907. *Chairman.*] What other company?—The Midland Counties.

Mr. *J. L. Douglas.*

5 May 1837.

12908. Mr. *Vane.*] In order to do that, what steps were taken after this meeting, where a resolution was entered into to oppose the competing line?—I had better read the resolutions entered into. "At a numerous and most respectably attended meeting of the proprietors and occupiers of land and others interested in the formation of a railway communication from the Midland Counties Railway, at Leicester, through Harborough and Northampton, with the London and Birmingham Railway at or near Blisworth, and a branch from Harborough to Stamford, held at the Town-hall, Market Harborough, on Tuesday the 1st of March 1836, and convened by advertisements inserted in the newspapers and circulars addressed to most of the landed proprietors of the neighbourhood; and at which meeting deputations from the towns of Leicester, Northampton, Stamford, Uppingham, and other places attended. On the motion of Sir Arthur De Capell Brooke, bart., and seconded by Holland Goddard, esq., the Rev. Sir George Robinson, bart., took the chair. The following resolutions were then entered into: That it is the opinion of the meeting a railway communication in the above direction is very desirable, and from the information laid before the meeting there is every prospect of obtaining the consent of the general body of the landed proprietors to this line, and that the income arising from the traffic on the proposed railway will produce a handsome dividend on the capital to be embarked in the undertaking. That a company be now formed for the purpose of carrying this project into effect, and that the Most Honourable the Marquis of Exeter, the Earl of Stamford and Warrington, and the Earl Spencer be solicited to become patrons of this undertaking. That the capital required for this undertaking be raised by shares of 50 *l.* each; that a deposit of 1 *l.* per share shall be paid at the time of subscribing, and that no further call be made, and no subscriber be liable or required to contribute to the expenses of the company beyond the above deposits until one-half of the capital be subscribed. That if the subscribers to the funds raised at Northampton and Harborough, for the purpose of opposing the Rugby line of railway, shall signify their wish, within a week from this time, to become subscribers to this company, they shall be at liberty to do so; and that the amount of the subscription paid or agreed to be paid by them towards such fund shall be taken as or in part of the deposit to be paid on their respective shares in this company. That the expenses already incurred by the Harborough, Northampton and Stamford committees or deputations be paid out of the general funds of this company, on such committees or deputations handing over to this company's committee the funds paid or agreed to be paid at the above places towards the expenses of forwarding the present object. That the following gentlemen be requested to act as a provisional committee, to prepare a prospectus of the company for circulation, to draw up rules for the regulation of the company, and to take such other preliminary proceedings as they may think necessary; namely, for Leicester, Mr. R. Birkley, Mr. W. Hind, Mr. H. Chamberlain, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Jones, Mr. Joseph Ellis, Mr. T. Nunneley. For Harborough: the Rev. Sir George Robinson, bart., Sir Arthur De Capell Brooke, bart., William De Capell Brooke, esq., Mr. Holland Goddard, Mr. John Abbey, Mr. Gatty, Mr. Nunneley, Mr. Heygate, Mr. Scott, Mr. Hubbard. For Northampton: Mr. Samuel Percival, Mr. John Beasley, Mr. Grundy, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. William Collins, Mr. Alderman Freeman, Mr. Alderman Williams, Mr. Barwell, Mr. Whitworth. For Stamford: The Mayor, Mr. Simpson, Mr. C. Lowe, Mr. Newcomb, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Godfrey, Mr. Tebbutt, Mr. Jelley, Mr. Mills, Mr. Torkington. That the above committee have power to add to their number, and that five constitute a quorum. That the committee have power to proceed with the opposition in Parliament to the Midland Counties Railway Company, in respect to their line from Leicester to Rugby, as also to enter into a negociation with them for their abandoning that line and taking our proposed line from Leicester through Harborough and Northampton, with the branch to Stamford; and in case such terms are offered by the Midland Company as a special meeting of the committee called for the purpose think ought to be accepted, then that the committee have full power to agree to such terms and to dissolve this company; but in such case, the deposits paid by any party in respect to any shares he may have subscribed for, shall be returned to him if he is not disposed to take shares in the Midland Company. That subscription lists be at once opened and left at the banks of Messrs. Goddard, Harborough, Messrs. Percival, Northampton, the Joint Stock Bank, Stamford, and Messrs. Pagets and Kirby, Leicester. That these resolutions be advertised in such papers as the committee may think proper. The chairman having left the chair, it was moved by W. De Capell

Capell Brooke, esq., and seconded by B. E. Bennett, esq., that the thanks of this meeting be given to Sir George Robinson for his impartial and efficient conduct in the chair."

12909. What sanction did it meet with from the land-owners on the line?—I do not know that that applies to this inquiry; I should be ready to go into it if necessary.

Mr. *Bere* objected to the question.

The question was waived.

12909*. [*A paper was handed to the witness.*] I believe that was issued by you?—Yes, it was.

12910. I believe that also was issued by you? [*Handing another paper to the Witness.*]—Yes.

12911. I see here that the same parties are not named as provisional directors, bankers and solicitors as are named in the other?—Very likely not.

12912. Who forms the London Board of Directors at this moment; does Sir George Robinson?—No; he is not acting.

12913. Has he withdrawn?—I cannot say that Sir George Robinson, any more than attending this meeting, has taken any part in it; he is particularly anxious, and has taken an interest in our favour; but he has never attended any meeting since.

12914. By being particularly anxious, you mean he wishes the railway to take place?—I should say so.

12915. Does he subscribe for any shares?—No; we go through a great deal of his property at Northampton, and at Leicester also.

12916. Has he not signified his intention to you of resigning the directorship?—He has signified to me this, he should not wish to be considered as acting upon the committee.

12917. Has he not written to you some letter, stating he wished his name to be withdrawn?—Since we have been referred to this Committee he has.

12918. Sir Arthur De Capell Brooke is the next director; does he still continue a director?—He is not now acting. He was very constant in his attendance; but he declined at the close of last April.

12919. He did act and take shares?—Yes, he did; and has been an active member.

12920. He has withdrawn?—Yes; he found it very inconvenient for him to attend, as it was found desirable for us to hold the meetings in London; he stated he could not attend those meetings, and he thought it better we should have a more efficient man in his room.

12921. Mr. Felix Ladbroke; does he continue as a director?—He has never acted. He gave me his authority to appoint him on the committee; but he has never acted.

12922. Did he not write to you to desire his name to be withdrawn before he went abroad?—I believe he did; it is about three weeks ago a letter was sent to us.

12923. George Pryme, esq., M.P.; does he still continue a director?—Yes; he attended the last meeting.

12924. Has he taken shares?—Yes, he has; he has agreed to take; he is acting, and said he should take a sufficient number of shares to qualify himself; he has not executed the parliamentary contract; but he will do it. It has not been yet tendered to him.

12925. He has not taken the shares?—The shares are allotted to him; he will execute this morning, I have no doubt, if it is sent to him.

12926. Mr. John Carruthers; does he act as a director?—No, he has not acted.

12927. Has he sent in a letter of resignation?—No.

12928. A verbal resignation?—He attended at some meeting, and a discussion took place as to the mode in which the Board should be conducted, whether the meetings were all to be held in London, or alternately in London and the country, and Mr. Carruthers did not seem satisfied as to the meeting being held in London alternately, and he has not acted since.

12929. John Teed, esq.; is he a director?—He never acted.

12930. He has since withdrawn?—He was in the same situation as Mr. Carruthers; he said he should not attend.

12931. John Charles Ord, esq.?—He still continues a director.

12932. And

Mr. *J. L. Douglas.*

5 May 1837.

12932. And has taken shares?—Yes.

12933. Daniel Curling, esq.?—He is a shareholder, and has attended once or twice at the office; but has not regularly attended the Board.

12934. Has he sent in any resignation?—I am not aware of any.

12935. John Grafton, esq.; does he still continue a director?—He said it was not convenient for him to attend the meetings; he said he should not attend any more of the meetings; and he has not executed the deed.

12936. Did he not go further, and say he did not wish to act as a director?—His letter is here, and I can refer to it. I will produce it the next time.

12937. Thomas Heger, esq.; does he still continue a director?—Yes.

12938. Has he taken shares?—Yes.

12939. How many?—Ten.

12940. Then out of this number of ten persons named here as directors, if I understand you right, there are only three now remaining?—There are only three who have attended the meetings generally.

12941. Those three persons now remain as directors; have they any local interest?—No; I should say not.

12942. How many shares is it usual for a director to take in order to qualify him to sit as such in any public company?—I am very little acquainted with any public company but ours; our subscribers' agreement stipulates that they should hold ten shares.

12943. Have these gentlemen taken ten shares?—Yes, they have all.

12944. Mr. Prime has not signed the deed?—No, but he is perfectly willing to do so; the last meeting of the committee we had he was there.

12945. Has he paid the deposits upon his shares?—I should say he has not.

12946. He is not qualified to act as a director?—He is perfectly willing, I believe, at any time.

12947. He is not qualified to act as a director, if your agreement states he should have ten shares, and you admit he has not got them. Is he qualified as a director?—That is a legal opinion.

12948. *Chairman.*] Under the terms of the deed of settlement, or under the terms of your prospectus, is he qualified as a director?—I should say not; until he has executed the deed and paid the deposit, he is not strictly a shareholder.

12949. Mr. *Vane.*] Then there are only two persons qualified to sit as directors on the London Board?—Yes; not as mentioned in the prospectus.

12950. Have many persons named in this prospectus as directors of the Northampton Board withdrawn?—I state this, that these committees, (I must give an explanation upon it); these committees were named at the public meeting at Market Harborough, and many of these parties had not been seen.

12951. *Chairman.*] You had better give a direct answer first, and then give an explanation afterwards?—

Mr. *Vane.*] Have many members of the Northampton Board withdrawn?—*Witness.*] Not any.

12952. At Market Harborough have any withdrawn?—Mr. Brooke has stated that he could not attend the meeting, and he wished another person to be appointed in his place.

12953. He did not wish his name to appear?—He did not state that; he was very anxious for the company.

12954. Has he taken any shares?—Yes, he has; he has paid the deposit upon twenty shares, and when he was waited upon with the deed he did not execute it, in consequence of some alarm given to him, I presume, by the party you represent.

12955. Has he since been requested to sign the deed?—He has.

12956. Has he refused to sign the deed?—He has.

12957. Have the whole of the persons here named as directors of the Northampton Board executed the deed?—I believe they have; if you will refer me to any name you think has not, I will see.

12958. Is there any other person in Market Harborough who has wished his name to be withdrawn as a director?—Mr. Holland Goddard has stated he could not attend; his avocations are such he could not conveniently attend, and he thought it better to appoint a man more eligible, and Mr. Charles Goddard is appointed in his place.

12959. Mr. Charles Goddard is named as a director?—Then it was before the prospectus was issued.

12960. Then Mr. Holland Goddard is not a director?—It stands in this way; there is a letter from him—

Chairman.] Ask him whether he signed the deed.

12961. Mr. *Vane.*] Has he signed the deed?—Yes, he has.

12962. Does he now act as a director?—He has not lately attended any meetings.

12963. *Chairman.*] Has he paid any deposits?—Yes.

12964. Mr. *Vane.*] Have any of the persons named as the provisional directors of the Stamford board, withdrawn in the last prospectus?—I am not aware of any.

12965. Have they all taken shares?—I believe they have, I do not know any one that has not; if you will mention any name, it will call it more to my attention.

12966. Have the persons named as the Provisional Board of Directors at Leicester withdrawn?—Yes.

12967. How many of them?—All of them.

12968. In what way did they signify their wish to withdraw as directors?—At the meeting held at Market Harborough the 1st of March, when this company was formed.

12969. I ask you whether or not they had withdrawn, and in what manner?—They have all withdrawn, and in writing.

12970. Mr. *Bere.*] Produce the writing?—I do not know that I can produce it.

12971. Mr. *Vane.*] Is that a copy of their letter [*handing a paper to the Witness*]?—Yes, it is.

[*The same was delivered in, and is as follows:*]

Gentlemen, Leicester, 18 Feb. 1837.

We, the undersigned, having been advertised as the Leicester Board of Provisional Directors of the South Midland Counties Railway, hereby disclaim all connexion therewith, and require you to erase our names as directors thereof.

John Ellis, *William Hind,*
Robert Birkley, *H. Chamberlain,*
Joseph Ellis, *Thomas Nunneley.*

To Messrs. Douglass and Abbey, solicitors to the South Midland Counties Railway, Market Harborough.

12972. Are Messrs. Ladbroke, Kingscote & Company, at present the bankers of the company?—Yes, they are the London bankers.

12973. How long have they been the bankers?—A short time before the date of this; I should think about last September, because we found that one or two of the bankers in the firm of Esdaile and Company, Mr. Pasco Grenfell and Mr. Thomas, were connected with the Birmingham Railway, and were opposed to us.

12974. Do those persons named in the prospectus continue the bankers to the company at Northampton?—Yes, they do.

12975. At Market Harborough are they still the bankers?—They are.

12976. At Leicester?—They are.

12977. At Stamford?—Yes, they are.

12978. Mr. Giles is the engineer?—Yes.

12979. You and Mr. Abbey are the solicitors, and these are the other officers, as named here, and the agents at Northampton?—Yes.

12980. And Stamford?—Yes.

12981. Have you any other bankers besides those named in this prospectus at the present moment?—Yes, we have.

12982. Be kind enough to inform the Committee the firm?—Messrs. Brown and company, at Leeds, at least the shareholders are directed to pay their calls into their hands, and there is a bank in Liverpool, the Liverpool bank, merely to receive the deposits.

12983. Are the London and Westminster bank connected with the company?—Not at all.

12984. Or the London Joint Stock Bank?—Not at all.

12985. You stated you had no other bankers in London but Messrs. Ladbroke, Kingscote and Co., and that the London Joint Stock Bank was never employed by you?—No.

12986. Did you or the secretary never draw any cheques upon that bank?—If you wish to ask about my private account I will tell you.

12987. No, I do not, certainly?—Then I can say the company have not any account with them.

Mr. *J. L. Douglas.*

5 May 1837.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

12988. You have spoken of one meeting at Market Harborough in 1836; was that the first meeting upon the subject?—No.

12989. Was not there a meeting almost contemporaneously at Northampton, Stamford, and Market Harborough in January of that year?—Either January or February there were two or three meetings, that at Stamford, and two or three at Harborough, before the first of March.

12990. Were there meetings held this year at each of those places?—Yes.

12991. At the Northampton meeting who was in the chair?—The Marquis of Northampton.

12992. Was that a meeting numerously attended by gentlemen in the neighbourhood?—Very much so.

12993. Was there a meeting at Stamford at the same time?—Yes.

12994. Who was in the chair?—Sir John Trollope.

12995. A gentleman of some fortune and distinction in that neighbourhood?—Yes.

12996. Was it numerously attended by gentlemen in that neighbourhood?—Yes.

12997. At the same time was there a large meeting at Market Harborough?—There was.

12998. Who was in the chair at that meeting?—Mr. Heygate.

12999. Is he a gentleman of fortune and respectability in that country?—Yes.

13000. Was Sir Henry Halford's son present?—Yes.

13001. Did he on that occasion say he should remain perfectly neutral upon the subject of the South Midland Railway?—He did; and was rather sore when some discussion took place upon the subject.

13002. There is a little difference of feeling between the agricultural people in the neighbourhood, and the people at Leicester?—Mr. Halford stated that the feelings of some of his constituents were against it, and he should remain neutral in parliament.

13003. At those meetings did the engineer attend also for the purpose of giving any explanation that might be required?—Yes.

13004. Mr. Giles?—Yes.

13005. I need hardly ask whether he is an engineer of eminent distinction?—He is.

13006. You attended last year on behalf of this company as a competing line before the Midland Counties Railway Committee?—We did.

13007. The whole of your case was gone into before that committee?—Yes, it was; a special application was made to the House when the Report was brought up, and a special report was made that we should be allowed to go into the case.

13008. It was carried by a large majority?—And we sat ten or twelve days.

13009. Upon that occasion the practicability of the line, the estimate, the traffic, and the shares were gone into?—Yes, they were.

13010. *Chairman.*] It was a *bonâ fide* detailed estimate?—Yes, as to the branch.

13011. Mr. *Bere.*] Was a *bonâ fide* detailed estimate given by Mr. Giles as to the part of the line between Blisworth and Leicester?—He stated what his opinion of it was; I do not think there was any detail.

13012. He was examined for a whole day, was not he?

Chairman.] Was the opinion he gave the result of a detailed calculation of the cost of the undertaking, or an off-hand estimate?

Witness.] No; he had gone through all the measurements.

13013. Mr. *Bere.*] Was not it a detailed estimate after surveys made, and sections and plans produced?—Yes, it was.

13014. *Chairman.*] What was the amount of the estimate for that part of the line which was brought before the consideration of the Committee last year?—£. 900,000.

13015. Is the additional work beyond that 900,000 *l.* which is now comprehended in the undertaking, the result of a detailed examination of the costs of the additional works; or is it an off-hand or guess estimate?—I should say, all in detail.

13016. Have you employed a professional engineer to go into the costs of the additional work?—Yes, certainly.

13017. Mr.

13017. Mr. *Bere.*] Upon the occasion of Mr. Giles being examined, was Mr. Vignoles, the engineer for the Midland Company, present?—He was.

13018. Who had been previously examined on behalf of the Midland Company?—Yes.

13019. When was Mr. Giles first applied to to take a survey of the line from Northampton to Leicester?—It was about a fortnight before the 1st March 1836; I should think the 20th February.

13020. Immediately after the formation of the company?—No; before that there had been a meeting held at Harborough and Stamford, at which resolutions had been entered into to employ an engineer, and Mr. Giles had been employed a fortnight or three weeks before the meeting of the 1st of March.

13021. Was he formally appointed at the meeting the 1st of March?—He is first mentioned in the Prospectus the 10th of February.

13022. What is he called in that Prospectus?—The engineer; he had been employed before.

13023. Did he after that survey the whole line in detail?—He did.

13024. Did he make a report to you?—Yes, he did.

13025. Did he attend and produce his sections?—Yes.

13026. And his estimate in detail was produced to you?—He did not produce it any further than he gave it in evidence; he gave it in evidence to the Committee; but he did not make a detailed report to the directors.

13027. He gave you the quantity of embankment that would be required?—No; he did not give any report to the directors.

13028. *Chairman.*] But the estimate he gave was the result of such examination?—Yes, it was.

13029. Mr. *Bere.*] Did you also produce some large body of evidence to show what the probable return would be for that outlay?—Yes, we did.

13030. Did you, upon that occasion, show that the probable income would be for the whole line, including the Stamford branch at railway prices 185,354*l.*?—What we gave in evidence was, the actual traffic upon the road.

13031. You gave evidence in the Committee upon the present traffic over that line?—Yes.

13032. Having given that, and taking the usual calculations that are made with regard to railways, and taking the railway prices, what was the probable amount of the annual revenue your railway would yield?—185,354*l.*

13033. Then I ask you whether you consider, as solicitor to the company, that there would be any probability of more than the usual return for the outlay of the capital in this undertaking?—I should think there would be, myself, decidedly.

13034. Did you not, upon that principle, reserve a certain number of shares to be distributed among the land-owners?—We made a reservation: we had a great many applications for shares, and the directors refused to allot any other shares, thinking it would be a bonus for the land-owners, or that they would be anxious to take them.

13035. Was that the opinion of the directors at that time?—Yes.

13036. That it would be the wish of the land-owners to have some shares, and a portion was reserved?—Yes; or that they would wish to be paid for land in shares.

13037. *Chairman.*] What is each share?—£. 50.

13038. Mr. *Bere.*] As solicitor to the Bill, have you taken a considerable interest in this?—Yes, I have.

13039. Have you personally had the chief management of it?—I have, certainly; I have taken the chief part of it.

13040. I ask you, till the petition of Sir Henry Halford and Mr. Spencer was presented to the House, did you ever hear of a single subscriber to the deed receiving a farthing for his subscription?—Certainly not; I never dreamed of it; I never supposed such a thing.

13041. *Chairman.*] What is the deposit?—One pound per share, with a power in the deed to call for another pound before the act is obtained. With the exception of Mr. Spencer and Mr. Spear, I believe all the London subscribers executed before last June.

13042. Mr. *Bere.*] Did they all execute before September or October, last year?—I think they did, except in one or two cases; a great many executed in April and May.

13043. What was the practice with regard to the persons applying for shares?

Mr. *J. L. Douglas.*

5 May 1837.

Did you allot certain shares to persons applying for shares?—In the first instance, immediately those resolutions were advertised in the papers the parties resident in the country made applications to the bankers for shares, and the bankers were instructed when the parties appeared respectable to receive their deposits.

13044. That, you say, was the practice when the prospectus was first issued?—It was before the prospectus was issued, when the resolutions were agreed to.

13045. Did you afterwards make any alteration in that arrangement?—When the Committee met in London, the application for shares and the returns of the bankers were laid before them, and they determined to allot shares to all persons who had paid the deposit.

13046. The resolution of the directors was, that persons who had paid deposits and applied for shares should have the shares allotted to them?—Yes; there were lists sent up to us of parties who had paid deposits in the country, and a resolution was passed that the shares should be allotted; and also another list selected from the applications that had been made.

13047. Are you in a situation to answer the question of the number of shares that have been applied for, and which have been refused?—I should say to the amount of 1,500,000 or 2,000,000.

13048. Did the directors exercise a discretion as to the persons to whom they would allot the shares? Yes, certainly.

13049. Are you aware of any instance in which a share has been allotted to any person who had not previously paid his deposit, and did not at the time produce his banker's receipt for it?—I am not aware that anybody has executed the deed without it.

13050. You are not aware of any person being allowed to execute the deed who did not before the execution of the deed produce the banker's receipt for his deposit?—Yes, I do know one instance, certainly; that is Mr. Ellis, of Leicester, one of the directors.

13051. Do you know of any other exception but Mr. Ellis; is Mr. Spencer another?—I do not know the circumstances connected with Mr. Spencer and Mr. Spear signing the deed; Mr. Gustard will speak to that.

13052. Within your personal knowledge the only person allowed to sign the deed who did not produce the bankers' receipt was Mr. Ellis?—The only one I am aware of.

13053. He lives at Leicester?—Yes; he was attending one of the meetings in London, and wanted to pay his deposit at the office: we told him it was much more regular for it to go through the hands of the bankers; that the Committee would not receive any. Mr. Ellis then applied to execute the deed, he executed it, and said he would pay the deposits in the country. We afterwards got a letter from him, stating, he had applied to the bankers to pay the deposit but they declined accepting it; and I should explain, that between the time Mr. Ellis attended in London, and the time he applied to the bankers, we had written to them, telling them not to receive any more deposits till they received advice from us, and several considerable sums were returned by the bankers.

13054. Mr. Ellis was an acting director at that time?—Yes.

13055. How many shares did he sign for?—Twenty shares.

13056. Is he a man of fortune and respectability?—Considerable.

13057. You had no fear of trusting him?—No.

13058. Is he a director of the Leicester and Swanington Railway?—Yes, he is.

13059. How has it happened that the Leicester committee have entirely withdrawn themselves from the direction of this company?—I should state, in regard to the Leicester committee, that at the meeting held at Harborough, Mr. Ellis and Mr. Birkley attended, as a deputation from Leicester; and when we were at the meeting forming the Leicester committee, that Mr. Ellis gave me this list in his writing, as the parties he thought eligible.

13060. You had his authority for putting down those parties?—Yes, it is in his own writing; at the same time Mr. Ellis stated, he had not got express authority from those parties, but knowing they took a great interest in the Swanington Railway, he had no doubt they would act, but he would see them the next morning, and if there was any difficulty, I should have a letter from him the next day.

13061. Did you get a letter from him?—I did.

13062. Was it an answer sanctioning the appointment?—Yes, with the exception of Mr. Biggs, Mr. Joseph Wetstone, and James Hudson.

13063. He

13063. He sanctioned the whole of the names that appear on the last prospectus?—Yes.

Mr. *Vane* applied for the letter of Mr. Ellis to be put upon the minutes.

[*The letter was handed to the Chairman.*]

The *Chairman* stated, he did not think there was anything material in the letter.

13064. Mr. *Bere.*] In the prospectus of this year you proposed to form a junction with the Leicester and Swanington Railway?—Yes; it was intended to do so, but not at the expense of this company.

13065. You proposed to make a junction?—Yes.

13066. Were those gentlemen who appear as the Leicester committee persons principally interested in that company?—Yes; most of them are directors in that company.

13067. Did it appear afterwards to the directors of the South Midland Company that it was inexpedient to form a junction with the other?—Yes.

13068. Was it after a declaration of that by your committee, that the Leicester committee withdrew from you?—Yes; it was because we would not incur this expense.

13069. Was it after that they put in this advertisement to which your attention has been called?—Yes, it was.

13070. When, by this advertisement, they disclaim all connexion with your company, had they been connected with your company as directors, by their own authority, before that time?—So far as Mr. Ellis had stated it; I have not seen the parties myself; Mr. Ellis and Mr. Birkley so stated.

13071. Was this prospectus constantly advertised at Leicester and other places?—Yes, it was.

13072. You have been asked about the London committee; was any proceedings taken in the London committee without notice being given to the provincial Board?—Never; the object of forming a London Board was to save the expense of the parties being brought up constantly to attend; it was thought better, in order to have access to the engineer, and for other reasons, to have a London Board.

13073. Did the provincial direction form a part of the London Board?—They did.

13074. Did they from time to time come up to attend the London Board?—They did.

13075. Are you aware of any meeting being held of the London Board without being attended by some of the provincial direction?—Certainly not.

13076. Are all the parties on the Northampton committee persons of respectability?—The whole of them.

13077. Are they persons interested in the welfare of the town?—Yes, they are.

13078. And is Mr. Percival a banker there?—Yes.

13079. Are the whole of them holders of shares?—Yes, all of them.

13080. Have they all executed the deed?—I have no doubt that they have.

13081. I observe that Mr. Vane, in examining you, was very particular in calling your attention to the provincial Boards, but he has not called your attention to the patrons of the undertaking; are the noblemen mentioned persons who have expressed any personal wish for the execution of the railway?—They have, every one of them.

13082. Do you pass through the land of any one of them?—Yes, we pass through the lands of Lord Cardigan; I think so; we go close to an estate of his by the Stamford Branch.

13083. You stated just now Mr. Pryme, is he the Honourable Member for Cambridge?—He is.

13084. You have been asked whether he had signed the deed; you say he has not paid the deposit?—No.

13085. Has it been signified to him that shares have been allotted to him?—It has; he read the deed, and discussed the qualification, and was aware of it.

13086. Was any representation made to him that he had a certain number of shares?—Yes.

13087. Did he assent to it?—Yes, he did.

13088. And you think he is ready to sign the deed?—I have not a doubt of it.

Mr. *J. L. Douglas.*

5 May 1837.

13089. You have been asked about the solicitors to this bill; was Mr. Scriven, the solicitor to this bill, resident at Northampton?—Yes.

13090. Is he the son of the steward of the Marquis of Northampton?—Yes.

23091. The gentleman who managed it at Stamford was Mr. Torkington; is he the town-clerk at Stamford?—Yes, he is.

13092. Have you with you the report of the Midland committee upon this particular subject?—Yes.

13093. After the investigation had lasted before the committee for some days, did they make a special report upon the subject?—Yes, they did.

13094. Have you got that special report?—I have a copy of it.

13095. Read it and hand it in. [*The Witness read the same.*]

13096. I observe that a part of what you read relates to no opposition being offered by the Midland company to your line, direct or indirect?—Yes.

13097. Who is the solicitor of that company?—Mr. Macauley.

13098. Is that the person now sitting by the side of the gentleman conducting these proceedings?—Yes.

13099. Is the town of Northampton the great thoroughfare for the traffic to Leicester at the present moment?—Yes, it is.

13100. *Chairman.*] You say that all who brought bankers' receipts to prove that they had paid their deposits were allowed to sign the parliamentary deed?—I should explain how that was; the deeds were executed during the Easter recess, when I was down in the country getting up the Bill. At first the committee would not allow anybody to sign the deed except they produced the letters allotting shares to them. Those parties produced the receipts, but the bankers had unfortunately omitted to put the names of the parties paying.

13101. Do you mean that the parties were not allowed to sign the deed unless they had paid the deposit, or that any persons who brought the bankers' receipts were allowed to sign the deed?—I am not aware that any party were allowed to sign the deed unless he produced the bankers' receipt, and we believed him to be the *bonâ fide* holder in it.

13102. But I collected from the terms of your former answer, that the only condition which was required of parties, to allow them to sign the parliamentary deed, was their producing the bankers' receipt, to show that they had paid the deposit?—No; we objected to it very much in the first instance. Several parties attended at the office when we advertised that the deeds were ready for signature. The directors objected in the first instance to let any parties sign, unless they were the parties to whom the shares were originally allotted. Many of the parties had called, and stated that they had bought shares, and it was impossible they could trace them. The directors felt that they had led to that difficulty themselves in some measure, because bankers had not put in the names of the party paying the deposit; and then the secretary was instructed, when parties produced the receipt and appeared respectable, to let them sign; and that was the way we got into the scrape we are now in.

13103. Was there any committee appointed to examine the names of those applying for shares, and to reject such parties as appeared unsatisfactory, and to allot shares to those whose names appeared satisfactory?—There was, and considerable expense was incurred in employing parties to inquire into the circumstances of the applicants, and they were divided into Nos. 1, 2, and 3 lists, good, bad, and indifferent.

13104. Were many rejected?—A great many; in fact, in consequence of having found that some parties had signed the deed whom we had doubts of their respectability, the directors determined not to allot any more shares at all, and no shares were allotted after the 15th of last April, (I believe till the 1st of November,) until they then got into a better system.

Re-Examined by Mr. *Vane.*

13105. You have stated that Mr. Halford attended at the meeting at Harborough, and he said he should be neutral; has he any land on the line?—He said he should not attend the meeting, or attend any parliamentary inquiry upon the subject.

13106. I understood you to say that the gentlemen on the line were very much in favour of it?—I said a great many were.

13107. You have stated that the estimate for making the line was 900,000 *l.*?—So Mr. Giles stated.

13108. And that it was given in detail?—Before the committee it was, but he did not make any detailed report to the directors.

13109. What

Mr. *J. L Douglas.*

5 May 1837.

13109. What is the estimate for making the line now?—1,100,000 *l.* the main line.

13110. That is 200,000 *l.* more than it was last year?—It is.

13111. That estimate has been delivered in to the Private Bill Office in the usual way?—It has, I should state, in regard to the increased estimate; it was only in January last that Mr. Giles, the engineer, made any intimation that it would be necessary to increase the estimate.

13112. Mr. *Bere.*] If he gave you any reasons you had better state them?—The first was in regard to the removal of the earth; ninepence a yard, last year, it was understood would be sufficient, but we found, on inquiry, one shilling, and one and threepence was the price. Also, that the land valuers had valued the land higher than he had when he made his estimate the last year; and it was also thought desirable to lay down much heavier rails than what had formerly been considered sufficient in practice; that it was better, though the outlay was greater in the first instance it was more economical afterwards.

13113. Did not that 900,000 *l.* include the branches as well as the main line?—No, certainly not.

13114. The main line from Blisworth to Leicester?—Yes.

13115. That main line now is 1,100,000 *l.*?—Yes.

13116. The increase you have accounted for?—Yes, partly so; I cannot go through the whole of the reasons, the price of the land, the price of the rails, and the removal of the earth.

13117. I believe Sir Henry Halford has been a determined opposer of the railway from the first time it was projected?—I should doubt that very much.

13118. Have you not seen an advertisement with his name attached to it, stating that he meant to oppose it?—I have seen advertisements by several landowners, whose names appeared, stating that they never authorized their names to appear.

Mr. *John Gustard*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *J. Gustard.*

13119. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—16, Bedford-street, Covent-garden.

13120. What are you?—I am nothing at present.

13121. Are you secretary to the South Midland Counties Railway?—Not at present.

13122. You were secretary?—Yes.

13123. When did you cease to be secretary?—The 1st of December last.

13124. What was the origin of your becoming acquainted with this company?—I was introduced to it by Mr. Ercke, in the house of Esdaile and Co.

13125. Have you ever acted as secretary to any other company?—No.

13126. Have you any knowledge of the way in which public companies were got up last year?—No, I had not; not previously.

13127. Did you act as secretary to this company from the first formation of it?—No.

13128. Do you know who was appointed as secretary before you?—I do not think there was one.

13129. When were you appointed?—On the 1st of April 1836.

13130. *Chairman.*] Who performed the duties of secretary before you?—The solicitor.

13131. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you obtain subscribers to the Parliamentary deeds?—No.

13132. I see your name is attached to a great number of names as the witness?—Yes.

13133. Will you state the way in which those parties were allowed to sign the deed; what was their authority to you for signing it?—They brought the bankers' receipt, and were allowed to sign.

13134. Did every person whose name you have witnessed in that deed bring a bankers' receipt for the deposit before you allowed him to sign?—Every one, except Mr. Ellis; at least there are two or three at first, some of the directors, who did not produce the receipt at the time, but it was forwarded afterwards, they being in town, at the time they signed the deed living in the country.

13135. Do you know what sums have been lying at the bankers' at different times?—No, I cannot say exactly.

Mr. *Douglas* stated that the bankers' book was here, and could be produced at any moment.

Mr. *J. Gustard.*

5 May 1837.

13136. Mr. *Vane.*] Were persons allowed to sign the deed, on producing the bankers' receipt, who had not applied for shares?—Yes.

13137. They were?—Yes.

13138. Had any shares been allotted to those persons without application being made for shares?—No.

13139. Then I understand you that the production of the bankers' receipt was a sufficient guarantee to you to allow them to sign the deed?—Yes.

13140. *Chairman.*] Whether they were the parties to whom shares had been allotted or not?—Yes.

13141. Mr. *Vane.*] You kept entries of the applications for shares and allotments?—Yes.

13142. There are some parties who have subscribed the deed a second time; did those parties apply for shares?—Some of them might; I think there are only one or two that signed twice.

13143. William Cook, 8, Capel-court, has signed twice?—I think he had some shares allotted to him, and others he purchased.

13144. In the country subscribers, there is a Mr. Woolwright, of Liverpool, who has signed three times; did he apply three times for shares?—Not that I am aware of.

13145. Did he three times produce the scrip or bankers' receipt for those shares before he signed?—I did not witness his signature.

13146. Are you aware whether there are any persons who have signed for a greater number of shares than those first allotted to them; and if so, whether the sums attached to their names have been altered?—There was never any alteration made at all.

13147. Where was the deed lying when the chief of those signatures were obtained?—No. 19, Charing-cross, the London office.

13148. At the company's office?—Yes.

13149. Did not several parties sign at Morley's Hotel, Trafalgar-square?—Not any one.

13150. Did any parties sign shares but at 19, Charing-cross?—Lincoln's-inn-fields.

13151. Mr. *Bere.*] You have removed your office from Charing-cross to Lincoln's-inn-fields?—Yes.

13152. Mr. *Vane.*] No person signed the deed except at the offices of the company?—There might have been three or four that signed at their own houses; not more.

13153. Did you take the deed to their own houses by their own request?—I took the deed to their houses.

13154. Will you name the persons to whose houses you took the deed?—A Miss Stanley, Cumberland-place, Portman-square; and Mr. Wagstaff, Piccadilly; and Mr. Levin, Great Alie-street, Goodman's-fields.

13155. I see you have signed for Jonathan Sills Pidgcott, in the last page, and for Mr. Thomas Heathcock?—Yes.

13156. Rowland Unwin and John Ramsford?—Yes.

13157. Can you produce the document authorizing you to sign for them?—I signed for them by a power of attorney.

13158. Had they paid the deposits before you signed for them?—Yes, they had.

13159. When you saw some of those parties come to sign, did not their appearance strike you as rather odd when you saw them sign for very large sums?—Some of them might; a few, perhaps two or three.

13160. Can you name those two or three?—I cannot name any.

13161. Did the appearance of Spencer strike you?—Mr. Spear.

13162. Did anybody else?—Not particularly.

13163. William Wright?—No; I should not know him if I saw him.

13164. Did these parties sign their names in the order in which their names appear upon the deed?—Yes, they did.

13165. Then the deposits upon the whole of these shares had been paid?—Yes.

13166. Has there been another call made?—Not when I was in the company's service.

13167. Can you inform me who is the secretary at this moment?—No, I cannot.

13168. You are not aware a second call has been made?—I have heard of it.

Mr. *Douglas* stated, he had acted generally as secretary, with the assistance of his brother, and that a second call of 1 *l.* per share had been made about the 10th of February last, and 300 *l.* or 400 *l.* had been paid in Market Harborough, and 400*l.* or 500 *l.* in Northampton.

13169. To Mr. *Douglas.*] Has there been any alteration in the call?—Yes, there has. That call of 1 *l.* has been rescinded, and a call of 10 *s.* per share has been made in lieu of it; we found the exigencies of the company did not require 1 *l.* a share, and in the present state of the money-market we did not think it prudent to call for it.

13170. Some of the parties have paid 1 *l.* per share?—Yes.

13171. Has that 10 *s.* been returned to them?—The bankers have been instructed to do so.

13172. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Gustard*).] I suppose the bankers' book will show us what amount has been received on the deposits?—Yes.

13173. Have any of the subscribers applied to have their deposits returned?—Not one that I know of; not to my knowledge, at least.

13174. Were you acting as secretary to the company when Mr. Giles's estimate was received for the main line?—I am sure I cannot answer that question. No; it must have been made before I entered the service of the company.

13175. Had you any idea what the estimate of Mr. Giles would be before it was received?—No, I had not.

13176. I mean the estimate that was deposited in the Private Bill Office this year?—I never had anything to do with that department; I cannot speak to it.

13177. You did not deposit the documents at the Private Bill Office?—No.

13178. You have never paid any sum of money, from your statement, to any persons for signing the deed?—No.

13179. Nor has any been paid, to your knowledge?—No.

13180. Who was the broker to this company last year?—We never had one.

13181. Did not Mr. Coglan act as broker?—He is an agent.

13182. He acted in Liverpool as the agent there of the company?—Yes.

13183. What is Mr Coglan?—He is a broker.

13184. *Chairman.*] Do you mean a sharebroker or stockbroker?—I believe he is both.

13185. Mr. *Vane.*] What per centage was Mr. Coglan allowed for his trouble?—I think it was 1 *s.* a share; I cannot say positively whether it was 1 *s.* or 1 *s.* 3 *d.*

13186. He was allowed 1 *s.* a share for retailing the shares?—No; for his trouble in allotting them.

13187. *Chairman.*] Was he consulted by the company as to the persons to whom shares should be allotted?—All persons residing at Liverpool were to apply to him for shares, and he was to revise the list, and allot them to the most proper persons.

13188. Mr. *Vane.*] Was that same office entrusted to any person in London?—No.

13189. No sharebroker or stockbroker was employed by the company here?—No.

13190. Just state to the Committee the way in which shares were allotted?—They were all allotted before I was in the company's service.

13191. You know nothing whatever about it?—They made application by letter, and then the shares were allotted.

13192. Mr. Douglas has told us that information was obtained as to the respectability and character of the party applying?—Mr. Ercke, a clerk at Esdaile's, gave him the information.

13193. You were not employed in it?—No.

13194. You know it is customary in all companies where the directors have appropriated shares, that the person to whom they have been appropriated should produce the letter of appropriation to the bankers?—Yes.

13195. That the banker allows him to pay the deposit, and gives him a receipt for the deposit?—Yes.

13196. And returns them the letter with a receipt?—I believe they generally keep the letter.

13197. Did your bankers keep the letters?—I think they did.

13198. You do not know?—I know they kept some of them; whether they kept all or not I do not know; I think it is most likely they did.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere*.

Mr. *J. Gustard.*

5 May 1837.

13199. After a person has received his letter appropriating the shares to him and obtained his receipt from the bankers, are those receipts often taken into the market and transferred from hand to hand?—Yes.

13200. You say applications are made from time to time by letter for shares?—Yes.

13201. Has the secretary, or any other member of the company, the means of having a personal knowledge of the parties applying, so as to become acquainted with his features and to know him again personally?—Out of so many people it is impossible to recollect all of them.

13202. You were asked just now if you had ever known any subscribers who have signed this deed have money paid them?—No, I never did.

13203. Did you ever hear of such a thing until this petition was presented?—Never.

13204. You were asked just now whether the appearance of the persons did not strike you; has it been your good fortune ever to be on the Stock Exchange?—I have passed it occasionally.

13205. Did you ever see persons there whose appearance might not strike you as very wealthy?—Yes.

13206. You have been asked whether the deed was signed by any persons except at your office; you have mentioned three persons, was it at their request you took the deed to them?—No; it was at the request of the company.

13207. Is Miss Stanley a person of property?—Yes.

13208. Is Mr. Wagstaff a tradesman in extensive business, carrying on trade in Piccadilly?—Yes.

13209. Is Mr. Levin a merchant of great respectability, carrying on business as a merchant in London?—Yes.

13210. Did all those persons pay their deposits?—Yes.

13211. In no one instance did you allow, excepting in the instance of Spear or Spencer, a person to sign the deed whom you did not believe to be a *bonâ fide* holder of the receipt?—Never.

13212. Do you recollect the directors objecting to any person being allowed to sign the deed who was not the person to whom the shares had been originally allotted?—No.

13213. You were not secretary at that time?—No.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane*.

13214. You state you know the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

13215. And you know the sort of persons that frequent it?—There are some of all sorts.

Richard Spencer was called, but did not appear.

Mr. *John Henry Morgan*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *J. H. Morgan.*

13216. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—No. 13, Yardley-street, Clerkenwell.

13217. *Chairman.*] What are you?—A jobber.

13218. In what?—In shares and stocks.

13219. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you signed the South Midland Counties Railway Deed?—Yes, for 20 shares.

13220. You have signed for 20 shares?—20 I think it was.

13221. When did you sign this deed?—I cannot say as to the time.

13222. About when?—Between May and July I think.

13223. That is rather a wide scope?—I can only date it from that time, because I was at that time residing at Chiswick.

[*The deed was handed to the Witness.*]

13224. Is that your name and handwriting?—Yes.

13225. Read it?—John Henry Morgan, 13, Yardley-street, Clerkenwell, gentleman, 30 shares, 1,500 *l.*; the whole of that is my handwriting.

The date of the subscription appeared to be the 25th of June.

13226. On signing that deed, did you produce to the secretary a receipt from the bankers, as having received the 30 *l.*?—I did.

13227. Did you write a letter to this company, requesting to take shares in it?—I cannot speak to whether I did or not.

13228. Had

13228. Had you any shares allotted to you?—No.

13229. How came you to be possessed of the bankers' receipt for 30 *l.*?—I paid them for a gentleman of the name of Kelly, a fellow jobber; I cannot speak positively to the name, but I think it was Kelly; he asked me as a particular favour to call on my way to town, as I had apartments at Chiswick on account of my wife's illness; to call and pay the money for him.

13230. You signed for Mr. Kelly?—To the best of my knowledge it was for a jobber; I signed it not for my own shares.

13231. Does the bankers' receipt state of whom the money is received?—No. They do business in bankers' receipts at the Royal Exchange, and the party that pays up gets them exchanged for shares; you must not think that the shares were paid up by them who hold them, because we dealt in them; they went from one to the other.

13232. You signed the deed?—Yes, I did.

13233. Are you a shareholder in this company?—No, I am not.

13234. Did you receive any money for signing?—I believe that Mr. Kelly paid me for my trouble.

13235. *Chairman.*] What did he pay you?—I think it was a sovereign.

13236. Mr. *Vane.*] He paid you for your trouble in going up to sign the deed?—Yes.

13237. Did you yourself pay any deposits?—No; I paid no deposits myself; I had no shares allotted to me; I did not write for them, to the best of my knowledge.

13238. Mr. *Bere.*] You said you could not tell?—It is impossible for me to state.

13238*. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you consider yourself responsible to pay 1,500 *l.*

Mr. *Bere* objected to the opinion of the witness being taken.

13239. Are you able to pay 1,500 *l.*?—No, I am not.

13240. You have been in unfortunate circumstances?—I have.

13241. I am sorry to put this painful question to you; I understood you to say your wife was ill; she is since dead?—She is.

13242. How were the expenses of her funeral paid?—I believe it was collected by some friends of mine, being many years upon the Stock Exchange.

13243. Have you signed other deeds besides this deed?—Yes.

13244. Do you know the deeds you have signed, and for what amount?—That I cannot speak to.

13245. You do not know how many deeds you have signed?—No, I do not.

13246. *Chairman.*] Nor to what amount?—No.

13247. Mr. *Vane.*] I see your name appears upon the City of London Railway for 1,500 *l.*, upon the Westminster Bridge and Deptford for 750 *l.*, upon the London, Shoreham, and Brighton, 500 *l.*, upon the London and Exeter, Salisbury and Falmouth, 500 *l.*?—I do not recollect signing a deed of that name. The London and Exeter I do recollect.

13248. These amount altogether to 5,450 *l.*?—Yes.

13249. Do you consider yourself able to pay 5,450 *l.*?—I always understood that the next person registering for the shares was the person that was liable.

13250. You were in the same circumstances when you signed these deeds as at the present moment?—No, I was not.

13251. Did you pay the deposits on the greater part of these?—On some I did.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

13252. Did you mean, when you went to the secretary's office, to practise a deliberate fraud upon the company?—I did not think so; it was an usual thing there; it was the common day's practice.

13253. Did you tell the company that you came there for Mr. Kelly?—Decidedly not.

13254. Why did you conceal that fact from the company, that you came there from Mr. Kelly?—I do not know the reason; but I did not do it.

13255. Do you not know you would not have been allowed to sign the deed if you had said you came from Mr. Kelly?—I suppose there was some reason for Mr. Kelly sending me there; I suppose he had signed the deed before.

13256. Do you not know you would not have been allowed to sign the deed if you

Mr. *J. H. Morgan.*

5 May 1837.

you had told the truth, that you had come on behalf of Mr. Kelly?—I have no doubt of it; there was no question asked me.

13257. *Chairman.*] What is it you have no doubt of?—I have signed the deeds for people when I have had the scrip in my own possession, without being asked a question: the person that holds the bankers' receipt is not asked a question; it is considered they are his property.

13258. Mr. *Bere.*] You have stated, you have no doubt that you should not have been allowed to sign the deed if you had said you came on behalf of Mr. Kelly?—I was not asked the question.

13259. *Chairman.*] What did you mean when you said you had no doubt of it?—I did not rightly understand the question.

13260. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you believe you would have been allowed to sign the deed if you had said you had come from Mr. Kelly, to which you say, "you have no doubt of it." The Chairman wants to know what you mean by "you have no doubt of it?"—If I had been asked the question who I had come from, I should have said from Mr. Kelly, and I have no doubt that I should not have been allowed to sign the deed; but they never asked me.

13261. Knowing that, why did you not mention you came from Mr. Kelly?—Because I did not consider it my business.

13262. What became of the shares; did you sell them, or take them back to Mr. Kelly?—I took them to Mr. Kelly.

13263. Have they been sold in the market?—I suppose they are.

13264. Do you know?—No.

13265. Do you know whether he sold them at a premium?—I should say at a discount.

13266. Do you know?—I cannot swear to it.

13267. You describe yourself as a gentleman upon the deed; is that your right character?—I have tried to uphold the character as well as I can.

13268. And you move about and represent yourself in society as a gentleman?—Certainly I do.

13269. And are received as such in society?—Yes.

13270. Who was present when you signed the deed?—That I cannot say.

13271. Who is Mr. Kelly?—A jobber.

13272. In shares?—I do not speak positively that it was Mr. Kelly; I speak to the best of my knowledge: I am in the habit of doing a great deal of business; it is impossible I can keep all these things in my head.

13273. You cannot say it was Mr. Kelly, then, now?—No, I do not.

13274. You cannot say who it was?—It was Mr. Kelly, to the best of my knowledge.

13275. Has Mr. Kelly anything, as far as you know, to do with the South Midland Company?—Nothing at all.

13276. I understood you to say, that this sovereign was paid you for the trouble you took in going up to sign that deed?—Yes, it was.

13277. Have you had any release from the company of your liability; you signed the deed you remember?—Yes.

13278. Have you ever received any release from the company?—No; I have received letters from both parties.

13279. What parties?—The party that wishes the shares paid off and the company dissolved.

13280. Did you ever receive any letter from the directors of the company?—That I cannot say; I have had three or four upon the business; I have had a statement of the company going forward.

13281. Have you ever received any release from the directors of the company?—No.

13282. Have you ever received any communication from them since you signed the deed?—No.

13283. Do you live at 13, Yardley-street, now?—Yes.

13284. At the time you signed the deed you were in better circumstances than you are now?—Yes.

13285. You spoke of applications having been made to you; by whom was it was it by the parties opposing this company?—It was signed "Playford," and giving a list of some of the shareholders that had signed.

13286. Are

Mr. *J. H. Morgan.*

5 May 1837.

13286. Are the persons you have received the letters from persons opposing the company?—It came from a party in the City.

13287. Is he the person making this application?—I have never seen him, nor spoke to him in my life; I believe it was from his office.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

13288. You say you believe you signed for Mr. Kelly; have you signed for other parties?—No; I have only signed this deed once.

13289. Have you signed other deeds for other parties?—Yes, ten shares for Mr. Carr in the company.

13290. You were asked to sign, you say, as you were returning from the country past the office?—Yes, I got off the coach as I came to town.

13291. Several letters have been mentioned you have received, have you received some from Mr. Playford?—One.

13292. One from who else?—I never noticed the letters; I was not interested in it.

13293. Were they not from shareholders who wished to have the company dissolved?—I believe the one from Mr. Playford was.

13294. You state you were in better circumstances formerly; were you at that time competent to fulfil the engagement you have entered into of 1,500*l.*?—I was not.

13295. Mr. *Bere.*] Could you have paid it by instalments?—At that time we never could have anticipated this panic.

13296. At the time you signed the deed, were you in such a situation, that if the calls had been regularly made, and distributed over several years, you could answer the demand?—I should say not.

13297. Were you to the extent of 1000*l.*?—No.

Mr. *Vane* stated he had summoned three other witnesses, but their names had been called out and they did not answer, and he would now proceed to other evidence.

Mr. *William Winkworth*, called in; and examined.

Mr. *W. Winkworth.*

13298. Mr. *Vane.*] WHAT are you?—I am nothing at present.

13299. You live upon your private property?—Yes, I do.

13300. Where do you reside?—I did reside at No. 10, Brighton-place, and I now reside at 5, Darby-street, King's-cross.

13301. William Dorrington of No. 9, Harleyford-street, Kennington, agent, has signed the South Midland deed for 11,000*l.*, did you make any inquiry after him?—I did.

13302. *Chairman* (to Mr. *Douglas*).] Produce the deed, and say whether William Dorrington, 9, Harleyford-street, Kennington, agent, 220 shares, 11,000*l.*, appears upon the deed?—Yes, I have no doubt he does.

13303. Just refer to the deed? [*the Witness referred to the deed*]—Yes, it is.

13304. *Chairman* (to Mr. *Gustard*).] Did Mr. Dorrington, on signing his name, produce the bankers' receipt?—Yes, this is the bankers' receipt, and he signed his name on the back of it.

[*The bankers' receipt was handed to Mr. Vane.*]

13305. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Winkworth*).] Did you call at No. 9, Harleyford-place, Kennington?—I did.

13306. Did you ask there for Mr. Dorrington?—Yes.

13307. Who did you see there?—I saw the servant.

13308. Did you see Mrs. Webb, the landlady, there?—I did not see Mrs. Webb; I saw a servant, and I told her to go to her mistress; she went to her mistress, and I heard, as I suppose, Mrs. Webb say to her, "Tell the gentleman she did not know Mr. Dorrington."

13309. Did you ask whether Mr. Dorrington resided there?—Yes.

13310. What was the answer?—That he did not.

The *Chairman* stated, that this evidence would be taken for what it was worth; but that Mr. Dorrington ought to be called if the residence given was impeached.

Mr. *Vane* wished to hand in a tabular statement of the number of deeds that Mr. Dorrington had subscribed, and the amount.

Mr. *W. Winkworth.*

5 May 1837.

The *Chairman* stated, that a witness must be called to prove that he has examined the printed copies of the deeds, and that he found Mr. Dorrington's name to such and such deeds.

Mr. *Vane* said he should be prepared to give that evidence to-morrow.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

13311. Tell me where you inquired for Mr. Dorrington?—No. 9, Harleyford-place.

13312. Is there a Harleyford-street?—I do not know.

13313. If Mr. Dorrington has described himself as living at Harleyford-street, Kennington-common, have you made any inquiries at that place?—I have not.

13314. Have you been present at any examination of this Committee before to-day?—Yes.

13315. Were you present when Mr. Dorrington was examined?—I was not.

13316. Have you seen his examination?—No.

13317. Or read it?—No.

13318. You were not aware he had described himself as living at 9, Harleyford-street, Kennington-common?—No.

13319. When did you make the inquiry?—About three weeks or a month ago.

13320. Did you call more than once?—No, I did not; having that answer, I did not consider it necessary.

13321. Did you see Mrs. Webb herself?—I did not.

13322. Do you know how long the servant you saw had been residing there?—I do not.

13323. Do you know whether it is a house where persons lodge?—I do not.

13324. Mr. *Foster.*] Did you inquire of the character of the party in Harleyford-street?—I did not.

13325. Mr. *Bere.*] Have you made any inquiries in the neighbourhood for Harleyford-street?—No.

13326. Do you know that he is described in the deed, as of Harleyford-street?—No, I believe not; Harleyford-place.

13327. Not in the deed? you have not inquired in Harleyford-street?—No.

13328. Nor whether there is such a street in existence?—No.

13329. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you inquire at No. 16, Great Charlotte-street, Blackfriars, for Mr. Wright?—I did.

The deed was produced, and it appeared to be signed by William Wright, 16, Great Charlotte-street, Blackfriars, gentleman, 270 shares, 13,500 *l.*; John Gustard.

13330. *Chairman* (to Mr. *Gustard*).] Did Mr. Wright sign the deed, producing at the time the bankers' receipt for the deposit?—Yes, he did.

13331. Mr. *Douglas.*] Seventy-five of those shares were allotted to the party, and the others he signed the deed for; he paid the deposit upon the seventy-five into Esdaile's himself, and the others he produced the receipts for; he has written his name and address also upon the back of the receipts.

13331*. Is that the same as in the deed?—Yes.

13332. Mr. *Bere* (to Mr. *Gustard*).] Did you receive a letter from Mr. Wright, of 16, Charlotte-street, Blackfriars-road, dated 2 April 1836, stating he had paid the deposit for seventy-five shares, and requesting the favour of being allotted fifty more?—Yes.

13333. *Chairman.*] Were any fresh shares allotted to him in consequence of that letter?—No.

13334. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Winkworth*).] Of whom did you inquire in Great Charlotte-street?—A person of the name of Warburton, who keeps the house.

13335. What did she tell you?—She told me she did not know a person by the name of William Wright.

13336. Did she know any other person by the name of Wright?—A person of the name of Francis Wright, whom she had known for years.

13337. Did Francis Wright then reside there?—No; she told me he had left about three years.

13338. Did you ask any further questions of Mrs. Warburton, the landlady?—I asked Mrs. Warburton whether she had letters sent there; she said letters had been addressed there.

13339. *Chairman.*] To whom?—To William Wright; but they had been returned.

13340. Mr.

13340. Mr. *Vane.*] Did Mrs. Warburton give you any opinion as to his character and responsibility?—That was Francis Wright.

A letter was put in, directed to William Wright, which had been returned, through the two-penny post, stating he was not to be found at 16, Great Charlotte-street, dated 17th March 1837.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

13341. When did you make those inquiries?—About a month ago.

13342. Did you inquire of Mrs. Warburton how long she had kept the house?—Yes.

13343. How long did she say?—I think she said twenty years; a very long time.

13344. *Chairman.*] Is it a dwelling-house?—A lodging-house.

13345. A number of persons lodge there?—I did not see any more than the person at the house; I apprehend there are two or three sets of lodgers there.

13346. You said, she said something of letters being addressed there and returned; did she say when the first letter was sent?—No.

13347. Did you inquire?—No, I did not.

13348. Mr. *Vane.*] George William Morrison, 56, Basinghall-street, gentleman, 210 shares, 10,500 *l.* [*The signature appeared on the deed.*] (To Mr. *Gustard.*) Did he, upon signing, produce the bankers' receipts to that amount?—He did; the bankers' receipts were produced.

13349. Mr. *Bere.*] Have you received any application from Mr. Morrison for shares?—Yes.

13350. Did he give you any reference to a gentleman of respectability and fortune, as to his respectability and means?—Yes.

13351. To whom?—Francis Eck, esq.

13352. Did he refer to Mr. Kingscote, the banker?—Yes.

13353. *Chairman.*] Did you, or any person to your knowledge, on behalf of the company, apply to Mr. Kingscote or to Mr. Eck?—No; because we did not allot them to him.

13354. Did any other person of the company, to your knowledge, apply to the parties referred to?—I believe not.

13355. Mr. *Bere.*] Mr. Kingscote is a partner in Ladbroke's house?—Yes.

13356. *Chairman.*] Was it usual on your part, or on the part of the directors, to make any inquiries as to the respectability of the parties where references have been given?—Very often we did.

13357. You did not in this instance?—No.

13358. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you know Mr. Eck?—Yes.

13359. Were you aware he was a subscriber for a very large sum to this company?—Yes.

13360. You did not inquire of him?—No.

13361. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Winkworth*).] Did you inquire at 50, Basinghall-street, for George William Morrison?—Yes.

13362. Who did you see there?—A Mrs. Gilson.

13363. Is that a lodging-house?—Yes; she told me that Mr. Morrison did lodge there about three or four months since, but that he had left there and gone abroad for his health; but if I inquired of Mr. Johnson, 5, Shorter's-court, Throgmorton-street, he could give me further information.

13364. Did you inquire of Mr. Johnson?—I did; he told me he believed Mr. Morrison to be a speculator in shares. I asked him as to his means; he said he could not tell, but he believed he was a man of limited income.

13365. Did he tell you the profession or calling of Mr. Morrison?—No, he did not.

13366. Mr. *Bere.*] Who is Mr. Johnson?—A stockbroker, I believe.

13367. Is he a sharebroker?—I do not know.

13368. Did he tell you he was gone abroad for his health?—He said he did not know where he was gone, for the fact was he had not seen him for some time.

13369. Did he tell you what opportunity he had of becoming acquainted with his means?—He said he had done business for him; I saw the young Mr. Johnson.

13370. You saw the son and not the father?—Yes.

13371. You

Mr. *W. Winkworth.*

5 May 1837.

13371. You were referred to Mr. Johnson the father, of course?—I did not know the party.

13372. You did not see Mr. Johnson the elder?—No, I did not.

13373. What was the age of the younger Johnson?—I should think thirty.

13374. Have you made any inquiries of the father?—No, I have not.

13375. Did Mr. Johnson carry on an extensive business there as a stockbroker?—I do not know.

13376. Mr. *Vane.*] Mr. Johnson appeared, I presume, to be acquainted with Mr. Morrison?—Yes, he knew him well.

Mr. *Vane* stated that Mr. Hamilton was the next name, but as evidence had been gone into with respect to him, he did not wish to call fresh evidence upon the subject.

Mr. *Bere* stated if any evidence was read of any former witness, the witness should be here to be cross-examined.

13377. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Gustard*).] Charles Williams, 37, Old Broad-street, accountant, seventy shares, 3,500 *l.* [*The name appeared on the deed.*] Did he produce to you the bankers' receipt for the deposit?—Yes.

13378. *Chairman.*] Was he an applicant for shares?—Yes.

13379. For that number?—No, for thirty.

13380. Were thirty shares allotted to him agreeably to his application?—Yes.

13381. Mr. *Vane.*] Were there two allotments to him?—No.

Mr. *Bere* stated that the thirty shares had been allotted to the party, and that when he came to sign for those he produced the bankers' receipt for forty more, and signed for the whole sum.

13382. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Winkworth*).] Did you inquire at 37, Old Broad-street for Mr. Charles Williams?—Yes.

13383. Who did you see there?—I called several times and saw his brother.

13384. What did his brother tell you?—That he had been clerk under him, who is secretary to the Polbrou Mining Company.

13385. Did you ask whether he still resided there?—He told me he resided at some place out of town, but he could not be seen.

13386. Did you ask him what salary he received for his services?—I did not.

13387. Did you learn any other thing relating to him at 37, Old Broad-street?—At my first going there, I saw a person, the matron of the house, that keeps the place.

13388. What did she tell you?—She told me that he was quite a young man; that he had left; that he came now and then to the office, and he had left three or four weeks.

13389. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Gustard*).] Henry Hills, New Road, Camberwell, gentleman, 100 shares, 5,000 *l.*?—His name is in the deed.

13390. Did he produce the bankers' receipt?—Yes.

13391. To that amount?—Yes.

13392. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Winkworth*).] Did you make inquiries at the New Road, Camberwell, after Henry Hills?—Yes.

13393. At any other places at Camberwell?—Yes.

13394. Did you hear that any person of the name of Henry Hills had ever been known at Camberwell?—No; I could not find any, except a person of the name of Hill; but not Henry Hills.

13395. *Chairman.*] Of whom did you inquire?—At different places I inquired; I inquired at the house of a Mr. Hill.

13396. Of whom did you inquire who had any knowledge of the inhabitants of Camberwell?—At different shops.

13397. Did you inquire of persons in the New Road?—Yes; I inquired at several private houses.

13398. How many?—Four or five.

13399. How many houses are there in the New Road, Camberwell; what is the length of it?—It is almost a mile long.

13400. Did you inquire in various parts of it?—Yes, I did.

13400*. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you seen the South Eastern Railway subscription list?—Yes, I have.

13401. Did you see Henry Hills put down there?—Yes, I did.

13402. What residence is given to him?—Battersea Fields.

13403. Did

13403. Did you inquire at Battersea Fields for Henry Hills?—I did.

13404. Did you find out such a person there?—Yes; I found there was such a person; I was referred to the Deptford Chemical Works.

13405. Did you go to Deptford?—Yes.

13406. Who did you see there?—Mr. Frank Hills; who told me he was the brother of Henry Hills.

13407. Did he tell you he had subscribed to the South Midland Railway deed?—He told me he did not know anything of his brother's affairs; but he would see his brother, and tell him to meet me at Garraway's the next morning, and give me every information; or, if the arrangement could not be such, if I came to Deptford the next day, I should see him there. Accordingly I went to Garraway's the next morning, and did not see him; and in the course of the day I went to Deptford, and saw Mr. Henry Hills.

13408. Did you ask him whether he had signed the South Midland deed?—I did.

13409. What did he say?—He told me that he had.

13410. Did he admit anything else?—He merely said he had disposed of his shares some time since.

13411. Did he tell you what he was at that time?—No, he did not at that time; he told me he had been in the employ of Mr. Edmonds, the stockbroker, No. 9, Change-alley.

13412. Mr. *Bere.*] He referred you to Mr. Edmonds, of Change-alley?—He did not refer me to him.

13413. Did you go there and inquire into his means?—Not as to his means.

13414. Did you inquire into the means of Henry Hills?—I did not.

13415. Mr. Edmonds is a broker?—Yes.

13416. I take for granted you asked Mr. Henry Hills where his residence was?—Yes; he told me he resided with his brother at Battersea Fields.

13417. Did you find that his brother resided at Battersea Fields?—Yes, and had chemical works there.

13418. *Chairman.*] In what situation had Henry Hills been in Mr. Edmonds' office?—He was a clerk there.

It appeared from a letter produced, directed to Henry Hills, that it had been sent to a variety of places, but he could not be found.

13419. Mr. *Lushington.*] Were you acquainted with Henry Hills?—No, I was not.

13420. Did you not find a difficulty in putting such a home question to him, if he had signed for such a number of shares?—I did not ask him the number; I merely asked him if he had signed, and he said he had.

A letter of application from Henry Hills was put in, by which it appeared he applied for forty shares; the letter was dated the 19th March 1836, from 9, Change-alley, Cornhill; and it appeared from the bankers' book that 40 *l.* had been paid into the bankers' by Henry Hills on the 25th of March 1836.

13421. *Chairman.*] He produced the bankers' receipt for the other 60 *l.*?—Mr. *Gustard.*] Yes, he did.

13422. Mr. *Vane.*] James Edward Groome twenty shares, 1,000 *l.*?—Mr. *Gustard.*] Here is the receipt.

13423. Mr. *Vane.*] How many shares?—Twenty.

13424. Mr. *Bere.*] Is the name on the deed?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes, for twenty shares, 12, Watling-street, gentleman, 1,000 *l.*

13425. Did he produce the bankers' receipt?—Yes, and paid the money in to the bankers'.

13426. Did he apply for shares?—Mr. *Gustard.*] Yes, for twenty shares.

13427. Were shares allotted to him?—Yes.

13428. Mr. *Bere.*] What is the address upon the letter?—12, Watling-street, London.

13429. Mr. *Vane.*] Was any inquiry made as to his responsibility?—I cannot say.

It was admitted, that it was not known that any inquiry had been made after Mr. James Edward Groome.

13430. Mr. *Bere.*] When the shares were allotted to these people, were answers addressed to them according to their letters?—Yes.

13431. And in consequence of that they came and signed the deed?—Yes.

Mr. *W. Winkworth*,

5 May 1837.

13432. Mr. *Vane.*] Parties could come and sign the deed without having received a letter allotting shares upon producing the bankers' receipts?—Yes.

13433. *Chairman.*] In this case was the application answered by letter according to the address?—Yes, it was.

13434. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Winkworth*)]. Did you inquire for Mr. Groom, No. 12, Watling-street?—Yes.

13435. Did you see him there?—Yes, I did.

13436. Did he tell you what situation he held there?—He told me he was a clerk to the parties where I saw him, Messrs. Fisher and Robinson, lace-manufacturers.

13437. Did he tell you anything respecting his circumstances?—Yes; he told me he had nothing besides the salary he got.

13438. Did he state what the salary was?—No, he did not.

13439. Mr. *Bere.*] Did you tell him the object of your inquiry?—Yes.

13440. He did not tell you what his salary was?—No.

13441. Did you ask?—No, I did not; he told me he did not know there was any responsibility attached to him in signing the deed.

13442. Are Messrs. Fisher and Robinson lacemen?—Yes, in a very large way; he admitted he had sold his shares.

13443. Did he tell you whether he had sold them at a premium or discount?—I did not ask him.

It appeared from the bankers' book, that 20*l.* was paid in the name of J. E. Groom on the 9th of April 1836.

13444. Mr. *Vane.*] Thomas Huntley, 18, East-lane, Bermondsey, merchant, 30 shares, 1,500*l.*?—Mr. *Gustard.*] It is here on the deed.

13445. Did he apply for shares?—Yes.

13446. How many?—Thirty.

13447. Were thirty allotted?—Yes.

13448. Mr. *Bere.*] Was the money paid?—Yes.

13449. And the money entered in the bankers' book?—Yes.

13450. Mr. *Vane.*] Was any inquiry made of the respectability of Mr. Huntley?—Yes.

13451. What was the result of that inquiry?—That he was considered a substantial person.

13452. By whom was the inquiry made?—By some one at the bankers'.

13453. What bankers'?—Esdaile's.

13454. Were they the bankers of Mr. Huntley?—No; the company.

13455. Of whom was the inquiry made?—Of some one in the neighbourhood.

13456. Mr. *Bere.*] Was an answer sent to him, saying he should have the shares according to the address upon his letter?—Yes.

13457. Mr. *Vane.*] You did not know by whom the inquiry was made?—Most likely by Mr. Erck.

13458. (To Mr. *Winkworth.*) Have you made inquiries after Mr. Huntley, at 18, East-lane, Bermondsey?—Yes.

13459. What was the result of that inquiry?—It is 13, but I found him in the same street.

13460. Of what trade or calling is Mr. Huntley?—He is a tailor.

13461. He describes himself in this deed as a merchant; are you aware that he is a merchant?—I should apprehend not.

13462. Is he in an extensive way of business?—He has no show-window at all.

13463. Is he living in a separate house?—I cannot tell; I saw persons there; whether it is his own house I do not know.

13464. Is he a master tailor, or merely a journeyman?—I apprehend he is a master tailor in his way.

13465. What sort of appearance has the residence?—Exceedingly mean.

13466. Did he tell you he ever dealt in shares, or signed other deeds?—He told me dealt in shares, and did not hold them, and had taken these shares on a speculation.

13467. Should you think he was at all capable of paying——

Mr. *Bere* objected to the question.

The question was waived.

13468. *Chairman.*] Are you aware of any circumstances relating to him that would lead you to suppose he is or is not capable of paying 1,500*l.*?—Not at all.

13469. Mr.

13469. Mr. *Bere.*] You spoke of his living in a mean house; where do you live yourself?—5, Darby-street, King's-cross.

13470. Do you keep house yourself?—I do not.

13471. Do you live as a lodger there?—I do.

13472. Is Mr. Huntley's house as good as yours?—Perhaps it may be in your eye.

13473. You do not consider yourself a mean person?—I do not know what I consider myself; that is not an answer for me to give you.

13474. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know whether any part of Mr. Huntley's house is let out in lodgings?—I do not.

13475-6. Mr. *Vane.*] Benjamin Henan, 39, Prince's-road, Kennington, gentleman, thirty shares, 1,500 *l.*?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes, it is on the deed.

13477. Did he apply for shares?—Mr. *Gustard.*] Yes, he did.

13478. For what number?—Thirty shares.

13479. Were the thirty shares appropriated to him?—Yes.

13480. *Chairman.*] Did he pay the deposit?—Yes.

13481. Mr. *Bere.*] Was the deposit paid into the bankers' in his own name the 31st of March?—Yes.

13482. Mr. *Vane.*] Was any inquiry made into the responsibility and character of Mr. Henan?—I do not know.

13483. Have you any reason to suspect it?—No.

13484. Did you return an answer to the letter according to the address?—Yes.

13485. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Winkworth*).] Did you inquire after Benjamin Henan at Prince's-road, Kennington?—Yes.

13486. Who did you see?—A woman of the name of Lucket who keeps the house.

13487. What did she say?—She said that Henan had lodged there some time.

13488. Did you ask if he lodged there then?—Yes.

13489. What did she say?—She said he lodged there.

13490. Did you ask her what profession or trade he was?—She said she did not know; she believed him to be a clerk. Sometimes he was not at home for some days together.

13491. What sort of appearance had the house?—Respectable.

13492. What do you suppose the rent of the house was?—A small respectable house.

13493. Was it worth 20 *l.* a year?—Yes; I should say it was not much more.

13494. Mr. *Bere.*] Who did you see at this place?—A Mrs. Lucket.

13495. Did you inquire from her where Henan could be found?—Yes; she said she did not know: she believed him to be a clerk; he went out when he was at home regularly.

13496. Did he go into London?—That she did not know.

13497. Did she say she knew he was a clerk?—No.

13498. In what situation he was?—No.

13499. Did she say he still lodged there?—Yes.

13500. Did you ask her what time he would be at home?—Yes.

13501. Did you call there then?—I have called there once or twice, but have never been able to catch him.

13502. Did you leave word you would call at any time?—Yes; but I never saw him.

13503. What time did you leave word you would call?—The next morning, before nine.

13504. Did you call at that time?—Yes; about half-past eight.

13505. Do you know the time that clerks usually go to the City?—No, I do not.

13506. They are in the City about nine, are they not?—I do not know.

13507. Mr. *Vane.*] C. R. Johnson, 4, Aldermanbury, gentleman, 20 shares, 1,000 *l.*?—Mr. *Douglas.*] It is on the deed.

13508. Did he apply for shares?—Mr. *Gustard.*] Yes.

13509. For how many did he apply?—20 shares.

13510. Were 20 shares allotted to him?—Yes.

13511. Did he produce to you the bankers' receipt for the deposit?—Yes.

13512. Mr. *Bere.*] Was the deposit paid in his own name?—Yes.

Mr. *W. Winkworth.*

5 May 1837.

13513. Mr. *Vane.*] Was any inquiry made into his character and responsibility?—I do not know; most likely there was.

13514. Mr. *Bere.*] Was there an answer sent to this letter directed to this address?—Yes.

13515. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Winkworth*).] Did you inquire at 4, Aldermanbury, after C. R. Johnson?—Yes.

13516. Who did you see?—He is in the employ of Messrs. Costar and Co.

13517. What are they?—Warehousemen I believe they stile themselves.

13518. Did you see Johnson?—Yes.

13519. Did you ask him if he had subscribed for 20 shares in this company?—Yes; and he told me he had.

13520. Did you ask him if he was capable of paying 1,000 *l.*?—Yes.

13521. What did he say?—Not 1,000 *s.*

13522. Did you ask him if he was aware of the responsibility he had incurred?—Yes.

13523. What did he say?—That he was not aware of it.

13524. Did he say any thing further?—No, nothing further.

13525. Did he say he had nothing to lose?—No, he did not.

13526. Did he mention any circumstance with respect to the deed?—Nothing more to me.

13527. Mr. *Bere.*] Did he tell you whether he had disposed of his shares?—I think he said he had, I will not be certain.

13528. You had better look at your book again and tax your recollection?—It is not in my book.

13529. You thought it rather unfavourable to your inquiry, therefore did not put it down?—No, I did not.

13530. You cannot undertake to say he had sold his shares, and in consequence of that, that he had divested himself of all responsibility?—No, I cannot say that.

13531. Did he did not assign that as the reason?—"Liable," his expressions were, he had no idea of any liability.

13532. Inasmuch as he had sold his shares; did he not say that?—No.

13533. Messrs. Costar and Company are warehousemen?—Yes.

13534. Did you tell him that the usual practice upon those occasions was to call for small sums of money at a time?—No, I did not; I was not aware of it at the time.

13535. Mr. *Vane.*] William Peters, 7, Vine-street, America-square, gentleman, twenty shares, 1,000 *l.*?—Mr. *Gustard.*] Here it is on the deed.

13536. Did he apply for shares?—No, he did not.

13537. Did he produce a bankers' receipt?—Yes.

13538. Can you tell me when?—The 25th of April.

13539. There was no inquiry, I presume, made after the character of Mr. Peters?—No.

13540. Did you inquire No. 7, Vine-street, after Mr. Peters?—Mr. *Winkworth.*] I did.

13541. Did you see him there?—No.

13542. Where did you see him?—Messrs. Thorpe, Roch and Company, wine-merchants, Forster-lane.

13543. Did you ask him if he had signed this deed for 1,000 *l.*?—I did.

13544. What did he say to you?—He told me he had sold his shares for nearly the same as he had given for them.

13545. Did he tell you whether he had signed the deed?—Yes.

13546. Did he tell you whether he was the owner or lodger at 7, Vine-street?—He told me he was a lodger.

13547. William Augustus Erck, No. 21, Lombard-street, gentleman, thirty shares, 1,500 *l.*?—Mr. *Douglas.*] It is in the deed.

Mr. *Bere* wished to take the opinion of the Committee whether the course now pursuing was quite fair, with respect to the responsibility of the parties, and the fact of their signing the deed, by loose inquiries by an interested party, of the description which had been laid before the Committee, without the persons connected with the company having any means of making inquiries of the parties from whom the information had been obtained.

Mr. *Vane* stated he had no objection to bring before the Committee every party that could be found who had signed the deed.

Mr. *Bere* stated that he hoped the inquiry would now cease as to communication made to the party now under examination.

The

The *Chairman* stated, that as the Committee were not confined by the strict rules of evidence, they could receive the evidence of the present witness, and attach that degree of weight to it which they thought it deserved; but that the evidence of this witness ought to be supported by the evidence of the parties themselves, where it could be procured without any great loss of time, or heavy expence.

Mr. *Vane* stated he would call Mr. Erck before the Committee as a witness.

13548. Mr. *Vane.*] Robert Fitzroy Holderness, 23, Change-alley, gentleman, fifty shares, 2,500 *l.*?—Mr. *Gustard.*] It is on the deed.

13549. Did he apply for shares?—No.

13550. Did he produce to you the bankers' receipts for the deposit of fifty shares?—Yes.

13551. Was any inquiry made as to his character or responsibility?—No.

13552. Were any shares allotted to him?—No.

13553. Mr. *Bere.*] He gave 23, Change-alley, as the address, and wrote it on the back of the receipt?—Yes.

13554. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you inquire at 23, Change-alley, after Robert Fitzroy Holderness?—Mr. *Winkworth.*] Yes.

13555. Who did you see?—I saw one of the firm of Woolfe, Brothers & Co.

13556. Does the house belong to them?—I apprehend not; it is merely offices.

13557. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you know that?—No.

13558. Mr. *Vane.*] Have they offices there?—Yes; and they told me they did not know of such a person.

13559. Does Mr. Holderness reside there?—No.

13560. Did they tell you that they knew him?—They did not know him. John Holderness they knew, and this Holderness they supposed must be his brother. However, I saw John Holderness, and he told me that this person was his brother; that he had had shares in this company and had sold them; and I asked him if I could see him; he said not.

13561. Mr. *Bere.*] At 23, Change-alley, you found out John Holderness?—John Holderness is a clerk to Messrs. Woolfe & Company.

13562. Living there?—Not living there.

13563. He has an office there?—He is a clerk in Messrs. Woolfe's office.

13564. He transacts business there?—He does business for his employers there.

13565. Did you find him at 23, 'Change-alley?—No.

13566. Did he tell you he transacted his business there?—No; his employers told me he was a clerk there.

13567. Did they tell you you would find him there?—No; they told me I should find him on 'Change.

13568. Did you find him on 'Change, or did you not?—I do not exactly recollect whether it was on 'Change, but I saw him.

13569. Where did you see him?—I do not know whether it was on 'Change or at the offices of Messrs. Woolfe.

13570. Did you see him at 23, 'Change-alley?—I entirely forget now which it was; but, however, I did see him.

13571. *Chairman.*] Did you see him either on 'Change or at his brother's office?—Yes, I did.

13572. Mr. *Bere.*] He told you that Robert Holderness was his brother?—Yes.

13573. He was not to be seen at present?—And he was not to be seen.

13574. Mr. *Vane.*] Frederick Blakesley, 12, Paragon, New Kent-road, gentleman, fifty shares, 2,500 *l.*?—Mr. *Douglas.*] It is here.

13575. Mr. *Bere.*] Have you got the bankers' receipt?—Mr. *Gustard.*] Yes.

13576. Was any application made for shares?—Yes.

13577. To whom?—Mr. Scriven, the solicitor, of Northampton.

13578. Just look at that letter, and tell me whether it appears by the letter he was personally known to Mr. Scriven?—Yes, it does.

13579. *Chairman.*] Did he pay the deposits?—Yes; to Messrs. Percival the bankers.

13580. Mr. *Vane.*] Were thirty shares allotted to him?—No, fifty; most likely he made another application.

13581. Can you produce it?—I do not know.

13582. Did you inquire at number 12, Paragon, New Kent-road?—Mr. *Winkworth.*] I did.

Mr. *W. Winkworth.*

5 May 1837.

13583. Did you see him?—I did.

13584. Did you then ask him if he had subscribed to this company?—Yes.

13585. What did he answer?—That he had.

13586. Did he give you any other reply to your inquiry?—No, he did not.

13587. Could you learn any thing about his responsibility for that sum?—I did not endeavour to do so; I considered him very respectable.

13588. Mr. *Vane.*] Augustus Austen is the next, 32, Fitzroy-square, gentleman, sixty shares, 3,000 *l.*?—Mr. *Gustard.*] It is here.

13589. Did Mr. Austen apply for shares?—No.

13590. Were any allotted to him?—No.

13591. Did he produce the bankers' receipt?—Yes.

13592. Did you inquire after Mr. Austen at 32, Fitzroy-square?—Mr. *Winkworth.*] Yes, I did.

13593. Who did you see there?—A person of the name of Medina.

13594. Who resides there?—Mr. Medina.

13595. Did you ask him if Mr. Austen resided there?—I did; he told me he did not, but he was on a visit there when he took his shares.

13596. Did you ask him where you could find Mr. Austen?—He told me he had gone to Madeira for his health.

13597. Mr. *Vane.*] John Smith, 174, Fleet-street, gentleman, 10 shares 500 *l.*?—Mr. *Douglas.*] That name is on the deed, here it is.

13598. Did he apply for shares?—Mr. *Gustard.*] I cannot ascertain.

13599. Did you inquire at 174, Fleet-street, after John Smith?—Mr. *Winkworth.*] I did.

13600. Who did you see there?—A person of the name of Hogg, who has lived there some years.

13601. How long did he tell you?—Some years; that was his answer.

13602. Did you ask him if Smith lived there?—I did.

13603. Did he tell you he knew Smith?—He told me he knew no such person; that letters have been directed there for him, and had been returned.

13604. Did you try any other place?—No, I did not. [Mr. *Gustard.*] I have ascertained he did not apply.

13605. Did he produce the bankers' receipt?—Yes.

13606. Mr. *Bere.*] What is 174, Fleet-street?—Mr. *Winkworth.*] A small hosier's shop.

13607. Do they let lodgings there?—No, I should think not; the house is too small.

13608. What side of the street is it?—The left-hand-side, going down.

13609. Did you ask at any other place but 174?—No, I did not.

13610. 175 or 176?—No, I did not.

13611. Did you look into the Directory to see if there was any John Smith, Fleet-street?—I did not.

13612. Did you inquire of the overseers if there was any John Smith living in the parish?—No.

13613. Or any other officer?—No.

13614. Either St. Bride's or St. Dunstan's?—No, I did not.

It appeared that letters had been sent to John Smith, 174, Fleet-street, through the twopenny post-office, and had been returned as not being to be found.

13615. Mr. *Vane.*] John Coleman of 20, Finsbury-place, Finsbury-square, ironmonger, two shares 100 *l.*?—Mr. *Gustard.*] It is here.

13616. Did he apply for shares?—Yes.

13617. Were shares allotted to him?—Yes; at that time he lived at Northampton.

13618. Do you know that of your own knowledge?—Yes; he stated that when he came to sign the deed.

13619. And the shares were allotted to him?—Yes; he paid the deposits to Messrs. Percival.

13620. Did you inquire at 20, Finsbury-place, after Mr. Coleman?—Mr. *Winkworth.*] Yes, I did.

13621. What did you learn there?—One of the firm of Baker, Milk and Bradbury, ironmongers, told me he had left them about six months, and they believed he had gone to live in South Wales.

13622. *Chairman.*] In what capacity was he there?—Shopman.

13623. Mr.

Mr. *W. Winkworth.*

5 May 1837.

13623. Mr. *Bere.*] How long have you then been engaged about these inquiries?—About a month or five weeks.

13624. Has it been your sole occupation during a month?—No, it has not.

13625. Has it been your principal occupation?—For a certain portion of the month.

13626. Has it been the principal portion of your occupation?—Yes.

13627. How many of those may you have inquired about; as many as 200?—No.

13628. 100?—No.

13629. How many?—Near 100.

Stopford Jones, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *S. Jones.*

13630. Mr. *Vane.*] WHAT is your name?—Stopford Jones.

13631. Any other name besides that?—No; no other.

13632. Where do you reside?—No. 3, Liverpool-street.

13633. Where?—Walworth.

13634. Did you sign the South Midland Railway Company's deed for 100 shares, 5,000 *l.*?—No, I did not; I am Stopford Jones, jun.

13635. You have not signed the deed?—No, I have not.

13636. Have you ever been as clerk with Messrs. Parker and Foster?—Yes, and I am now.

13637. Did you not inform a gentleman ——

Mr. *Bere* objected to the question, inasmuch as Mr. Vane could not show his own witness was not worthy of credit.

13638. *Chairman.*] Have you a father?—Yes.

13639. What is he?—A secretary now at the wharf.

13640. Mr. *Bere.*] The Hamborough Wharf?—Yes.

13641. *Chairman.*] Does he live there?—No, he does not now.

13642. Where does he live?—No. 3, Liverpool-street, Walworth.

13643. Is he now secretary to the Hamborough Wharf?—Yes.

Mr. *Vane* stated, he had no more witnesses to call at present, the persons who had been summoned not being in attendance.

Sabbati, 6° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Warburton.	Mr. Lushington.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. Brotherton.	

HENRY WARBURTON, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Richard Richards* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *R. Richards.*

6 May 1837.

13644. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—Temple-place, Hackney-road.

13645. What are you?—A builder.

13646. Have you signed the South Midland Counties Railway deed?—I have. [*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*] That is my signature.

13647. Is that your name and handwriting?—Yes.

13648. Is the whole of that line your writing?—Yes; "Richard Richards, Temple-place, Hackney-road, 40 shares, 2,000 *l.*"

13649. Did you see the witness sign his name to it?—No, I did not.

13650. Where did you sign the deed?—At Charing-cross.

13651. Did you apply for shares in this company?—I did.

13652. For how many shares did you apply?—

13652*. Mr. *Bere.*] You applied by letter?—I did.

13653. Is that your letter [*handing one to the Witness*]?—Yes.

13654. For how many?—Twenty.

13655. Mr. *Vane.*] Did they allot any shares to you?—They did; but they did not allow me to pay the shares up; they did not allow me to pay the deposit.

13656. Who did not allow you?—The bankers.

13657. Why did not the bankers allow you to pay the deposit?—Because

Mr. *R. Richards.*

6 May 1837.

I was one day after the time allowed by the letter; but they were issuing letters of appropriation at that time to others.

13658. Mr. *Bere.*] What are you looking at?—It is a private memorandum of my own.

13659. You must let me look at it?—No; it is a private memorandum; it is what I have taken out of my own book.

Mr. *Bere* claimed to look at the memorandum.

The *Chairman* stated, that the Committee had decided that a private memorandum of a Witness could not be shown to the Counsel.

13660. Mr. *Vane.*] You say the bankers would not allow you to pay the deposits?—Yes.

13661. How came it that you afterwards signed the deed for 40 shares?—Because I was paid for doing it.

13662. Who paid you for doing it?—Mr. Alexander Young, of the Stock Exchange.

13663. Did he give you the bankers' receipt for 40 *l.*?—He entrusted me with a bankers' receipt to get the scrip, because they were jobbing in the bank receipts before they gave them out.

13664. What took place between you and Mr. Young?—Mr. Young had sold a great many of the shares before they came out; and because he would not be a bear in those shares, that is, bought shares, to deliver to those he had sold them to before; he bought bankers' receipts.

13665. *Chairman.*] Tell us what took place between you and Mr. Young?—I do not know whether Mr. Young has signed the deed or not; but Mr. Young asked me if I was going to the South Midland Office; I said I was not; I said, "What is it you want, Mr. Young?" he said, "I wish some one to sign for 40 shares, and I would not mind standing a sovereign;" I said, "I will do it for you;" I consented to it, and took a cab, and went up to the office, and signed for the shares.

13666. What is the paper you are referring to?—It is merely a memorandum I took out of my jobbing-book.

13667. When did you make that memorandum?—I put down this in the jobbing-book at the time.

13668. Is the paper you are reading from, a copy of what you put down in the jobbing-book?—No; I am not reading anything; I am merely looking at my summons.

13669. Have you another paper?—It is merely Mr. Alexander Young's name.

13670. There is no memorandum?—No, none at all.

13671. Go on as to what took place between you and Mr. Young?—I signed for the shares, and went back and delivered the shares to Mr. Young, and the scrip in exchange for the bankers' receipt; I gave the receipt to one of the directors in the office.

13672. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know who it was?—No; it was some old gentleman who was sitting in the office; I put the bankers' receipt down on the table, and when I had signed the deed, they gave me the scrip, which I gave to Mr. Young in exchange for the bankers' receipt.

13673. There has been a call of 10*s.* a share made on these shares; are you capable of paying the call upon those shares?—Certainly not.

13674. What are your circumstances?—My circumstances enable me to live; but as to paying any deposit on shares I cannot.

13675. Have you signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway for 1,500*l.*?—I have.

13676. Have you signed the London, Shoreham and Brighton Railway for 3,000*l.*?—Yes; that is Gibbs's line.

13677. Yes?—I have.

13678. Have you signed the South Western deed for 2,500*l.*?—I have.

13679. Have you signed the Great North of England deed, describing yourself as residing at No. 2, Waterloo-terrace, carpenter, for 5,000*l.*?—I have; I lived there at that time.

13680. Have you also signed another London and Brighton deed for 400*l.*?—What Brighton is it? I have signed only one Brighton, that is Gibbs's line, and I took it upon myself.

13681. I find you have signed for 14,400*l.*, are you capable of performing those contracts?—I am not.

Cross-

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere*.

13682. Were you paid for all this?—No.

13683. Were you paid for any besides these?—I was.

13684. When you went to the office of the South Midland, did you tell them the shares were not your own, but you had them from Mr. Young?—No.

13685. Did you not know, if you had told them that, that you would not be allowed to sign the deed?—I do not know that.

13686. Do you believe they would have allowed you to sign that deed, if you told them the shares were not your own?—They did not ask me any questions.

13687. Do you not know, from your experience as a jobber, that if you had told them the shares were not your own, they would not have allowed you to sign the deed?—I had no business to tell them.

13688. Did you not know that they would not have allowed you to sign the deed if you had told them?—I did not.

13689. Did you not believe it?—No, I did not.

13690. You did not know you were practising a gross fraud upon the company?—I did not.

13691. Did you think you were practising a gross fraud, when you signed to the extent of 14,000*l.*, when you had not a farthing?—I did not.

13692. How long have you been carrying on this system of fraud?—I have not been carrying on a system of fraud.

13693. Do you not call this a system of fraud?—No.

13694. Do you know you have made yourself responsible to this company to the extent of 2,000*l.*?—I cannot see that I have made myself responsible when there is no company existing.

13695. You mean to tell the Committee the South Midland Company does not exist?—I consider it entirely a speculation till such time as the Act is obtained.

13696. Did you not sign your name, making yourself responsible for the 2,000*l.*?—Provided they got the Act.

13697. You made yourself responsible for 2,000*l.*, if they got the Act?—Yes; but you must know there is a transfer of shares, the same as there is in bank stock or any other stock.

13698. Do you not know that the transfer of shares does not relieve you from the obligation you are under in signing the deed?—I was not aware of it.

13699. You were not aware when you signed the deed what the contents were?—I was not.

13700. Are you in the habit of signing deeds, the contents of which you do not know?—I have been, unfortunately.

13701. Do you call that honest?—I do not consider it dishonest.

13702. You do not consider it dishonest to put your name to that, the contents of which you are utterly ignorant?—I do not.

13703. Who is Mr. Young?—A stock-jobber on the Stock Exchange.

13704. A respectable man?—I have always found him so.

13705. A man of substance?—I do not know; I cannot speak as to his property.

13706. As far as you know, is he not a man of substance?—He is a very respectable man; I know nothing of his private affairs.

13707. Do you know whether Mr. Young has anything to do with the South Midland Company?—I do not know.

13708. Is Mr. Young here?—I do not know.

13709. Did you inform Mr. Young you meant to come here as a witness to-day?—I did not; I did not know it till last night myself.

13710. I observe you signed your name upon the back of this bankers' receipt when you produced it before the company?—That is my handwriting.

13711. You are a builder?—I served my time as a carpenter and builder.

13712. What particular connexion is there between a carpenter and a builder?—You have a right to do what you think proper; if you are a carpenter you may be a builder if you like, you are not bound to confine yourself to the trade you were brought up to.

13713. Are you worth anything, or are you a speculator?—I am a speculator, and work at my business.

13714. Is your business worth anything?—No, it is not; but I do not consider that has anything to do with this business.

13715. Did you tell them at the office, when you went to sign the deed, that you were worth nothing?—They did not seem to ask anyone any question I ever heard.

Mr. *R. Richards.*

6 May 1837.

13716. Were there any other shareholders present when you paid your shares?—No.

13717. Were you ever present when any shareholder was there?—No.

13718. Why do you say they never made any inquiry?—Because I am connected with a great many who have been there.

13719. You speak from what you have heard?—I speak generally.

13720. Only one person was present?—One old gentleman sitting at the table.

13721. Is that all?—Except the clerks in the office.

13722. Was Mr. Gustard, who is opposite to you, who attested your signature?—I do not recollect his features; there were other persons, that I considered as clerks, in the office; and the old gentleman sitting in the chair I considered a director.

13723. Do you live at Temple-place, Hackney-road?—I do not; I left it last quarter.

13724. Where do you live now?—At Bethnal-green.

13725. Is that your own house?—No; I rent it.

13726. Do you rent the whole house?—Yes.

13727. Do you carry on a business there?—No.

13728. Where do you carry on your business?—I do not carry on any business of my own, I manage it for another person.

13729. Have you ever been a bankrupt?—No.

13730. Or through the Insolvent Court?—No; I am an honest man.

13731. *Chairman.*] Was this deed read over to you or explained?—No.

13732. Mr. *Bere.*] Did you require it?—I did not.

13733. Mr. *Vane.*] Did any person in the room ask you whether these shares belonged to you?—They did not.

13734. You did not then consider it necessary to tell them?—I did not.

13735. *Chairman.*] Who paid the deposit?

Mr. *Bere* stated the bankers' receipt identified by the Witness was for 40*l.*, dated 29th March 1836, by Esdailes'; and it appeared from Esdailes' book that the only sum of that amount paid in on that day was from R. C. Williams; he also produced the letter of R. C. Williams, Torrington-park, applying for 40 shares.

13736. Mr. *Forster.*] You stated you tendered money, which was refused by the directors?—Yes, that was my own.

13737. Have you any objection to state who gave you that money?—A friend of mine furnished me with the money.

13738. *Chairman.*] You say you were paid for signing in other companies?—Only one.

13739. What others?—Only one deed.

13740. What was it?—The Westminster Bridge and Deptford; the others I paid upon myself, the rest of the money afterwards.

13741. Mr. *Forster.*] What was the deposit you tendered, and which they refused, being too late?—I cannot say how much it was; I cannot say whether it was 20*l.* or 30*l.*

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Augustus Erck*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *W. A. Erck.*

13742. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—Clapham.

13743. What are you?—A corresponding clerk at Messrs. Williams, Deacon & Company.

13744. The bankers?—Yes.

13745. Were you a clerk in the house of Messrs. Esdaile & Co.?—I was.

13746. Were Messrs. Esdaile & Co. the bankers of the South Midland Counties Railway?—They were.

13747. Were you employed by the directors of the South Midland Counties Railway to make inquiries after the responsibility and character of persons applying for shares?—I was not.

13748. Did you make any inquiries after any persons who applied?—I did not. [*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*]—That is my handwriting.

13749. Is the whole of that line in your handwriting?—Yes, for 30 shares.

13750. Do you consider yourself capable of paying the sum you have subscribed for?—Certainly I do; but I do not hold them now.

13751. Mr. *Bere.*] You have parted with them?—Yes.

13752. Mr. *Vane.*] Was Mr. Risbee a fellow clerk of yours in the house of Esdaile & Co.?—Yes, he was.

13753. Do you know his signature?—I probably may know it.

[*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*]

13754. Is that the handwriting of Mr. Risbee?—Yes, it is; it is not Reslen, it is Risbee; your copy is miscopied.

13755. One hundred and twenty shares, 6,000*l.*?—Yes.

13756. What is Mr. Risbee?—He was a fellow clerk.

13757. Is he capable of paying the sum he has signed his name for?—I cannot say exactly he may; he would have been the best person to ask.

13758. *Chairman.*] Where is he?—He is in Northamptonshire, in the Northamptonshire Union Bank.

13759. Do you know what salary he was in the receipt of?—No, I do not exactly know; he had property in Essex.

13760. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you any idea of what was the amount of his salary about?—No.

13761. Was it 200*l.* a year?—No, I should think not.

13762. Was it 100*l.* a year?—Yes, more than that.

13763. Was it 150*l.*?—Yes, I should think it was; he was much my junior.

13764. You cannot say whether you think he is capable of paying 6,000*l.*?—I cannot say one way or the other, whether he is or is not.

13765. You state positively you made no inquiry after any of the persons who had signed the South Midland deed?—Yes, I do.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

13766. Messrs. Esdaile at that time were the bankers to the company?—They were.

13767. You were particularly concerned in this part of the transaction at the bankers?—No, I was not; I happened to be acquainted with one or two gentlemen belonging to the company, and sometimes references were made to me in consequence, not that it was my particular duty to do anything of the kind.

13768. Some reference was made to you in regard to the characters of persons who applied for shares?—Yes.

13769. When references were made to you, did you give an opinion?—I merely gave an opinion upon the appearance of the letter, whether they were parties who wrote from a speculating feeling, or whether they were genuine, but I never went out to inquire.

13770. From time to time were lists shown to you of applicants for shares?—Yes.

13771. Who showed them to you, was it the company?—Some of the gentlemen connected with the company, when they came to the office to pay in money and to see how the account ran.

13772. Among other gentlemen, did Mr. Percival occasionally come?—Yes.

13773. Did he show you the applications made to them for shares?—Yes.

13774. Did he appeal to you, as conversant with the city, whether you knew anything against the names on the list?—Yes.

13775. When you did know, did you tell him?—I did.

13776. Have you a pretty extensive acquaintance with the city?—I have been 28 years in Messrs. Esdaile's bank, and from these circumstances, in the city, I know a good deal about it.

13777. Did you think, when a letter was shown to you, you had the means of seeing whether it was from a speculator or from a *bonâ fide* person?—Yes, I thought I could form an opinion.

13778. Did the company entertain such an opinion of your services that they actually paid you for this superintendence?—No; they made me a present of 10*l.* for the trouble I had had in looking over the letters, but I had no knowledge of that at the time I did it.

13779. It was not given to you till the 9th June 1836?—It was some time afterwards.

13780. Did you from time to time attend at the company's offices at Charing-cross?—I may have gone up two or three times in the evening.

13781. Have you gone up when they have been discussing that question?—No.

13782. *Chairman.*] Were all the London applications shown to you?—No; part of them.

 13783. Occasionally?—

Mr. *W. A. Erck.*

6 May 1837.

13783. Occasionally?—Yes, three or four times.

13784. Mr. *Bere.*] Can you at all recollect the number of names shown to you?—No, I cannot; they were not all shown me.

13785. Were as many as 100 shown to you?—Yes.

13786. Were as many as 200 shown to you?—There may have been from 100 to 200; there could not have been more than 200.

13787. Was this the book shown to you [*exhibiting one to the Witness*]?—No; I saw the original letters.

13788. *Chairman.*] Do you know whether, in consequence of your representation, any parties were refused shares?—I think so; I think a great many were refused.

13789. Mr. *Forster.*] Was that with the consent of the principals of your house, that yourself and your fellow clerk became subscribers for the amount set opposite to your names?—Nothing was said to them about it.

13790. It was in their knowledge?—Very likely.

13791. Mr. *Bere.*] Was there any clerk besides the one you have mentioned?—No.

13792. You were with Messrs. Esdaile 28 years?—Yes.

13793. And would have remained there till now, if they had not stopped?—Yes.

13794. You are now with Messrs. Williams?—Yes, in the same situation and the same standing; I am acquainted with this part of the country in Northampton, and I was interested in the line; I have a little property there.

13795. Between Northampton and Leicester?—Yes.

13796. You had a personal interest in the line?—Yes.

13797. From what you have seen of this company, has it not been from the commencement carried on *bonâ fide*?—Certainly *bonâ fide.*

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

13798. You say you know most of these persons; do you know William Dorrington?—I do not know the persons.

13799. Was any application from William Dorrington shown to you?—I cannot say.

13800. Do you know William Dorrington?—No.

13801. Was the application from John Pellatt shown to you?—I do not know any names; I judge from the appearance of the letters as to the person's respectability or not.

13802. You have judged whether you knew the parties by name or not?—Yes; I did not know the parties, only from the appearance I observed in the letters.

13803. You stated that you had been clerk in a banking house 30 years, and of course you know some of those persons?—No, I did not.

13804. Did you see the letter of Henry Hills?—I cannot say I recollect any names; I never gave it a thought after the things were passed out of my hand.

13805. You merely judged from seeing the letter and seeing the handwriting?—Yes; supposing there were letters the company received from persons of known respectability in the town, there would be no difficulty upon them.

[*The letter of William Dorrington was shown to the Witness.*]

13806. *Chairman.*] Do you recollect seeing that letter, and giving any opinion upon it?—No, I do not think I did.

13807. If that letter was referred to you, should you be able to give any opinion upon it?—[*The Witness examined the Letter.*]

13808. Mr. *Vane.*] Should you consider he was responsible for 2,000*l.*?—I should not think he was.

[*The letter of William Wright was shown to the Witness.*]

13809. *Chairman.*] Were any instructions given to the bankers by the directors of the company, that when parties appeared to be respectable they should receive their deposits?—I am not aware; it was not my department to hear that.

13810. You did not hear of any such communication?—No; the cashiers were the parties who received the deposits; I was not the cashier, I was corresponding clerk.

13811. You do not know what instructions were given to the bankers about parties coming with deposits?—The only instructions were, that they were to receive the deposits if they were within a given date, according to that in the letter.

13812. They

13812. They were necessarily to produce the letters before the deposits were to be received?—Yes.

[*The Witness looked at the letter of William Wright.*]

13813. Mr. *Vane.*] Was that letter shown to you?—I do not think it was.

13814. What opinion should you give of that letter?—I cannot say.

13815. *Chairman.*] Will you inform us what are the circumstances in the letter that guide your judgment; how do you determine, from looking at the letter, what is the condition or circumstances of the writer?—I can pretty well tell from the character of the writing; there might have been many that I thought were not good, that were very good; I cannot say.

[*The letter of George William Morrison was handed to the Witness.*]

13816. Was that letter submitted to you for your opinion?—I do not think it was.

13817. What should you say, on seeing that letter, as to the character and responsibility of the party?—I do not know; there were not a great many I did give an opinion upon. [*Another Letter was shown to the Witness.*] That is not my name to it; that is Eck on the Stock Exchange.

[*The letter of William Bamfield was shown to the Witness.*]

13818. Mr. *Vane.*] Was that letter submitted to you for your opinion?—It may have been, or it may not have been; there are some I have marked; I should think that was a respectable person.

13819. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you happen to know the gentleman to whom reference is made by Mr. Bamfield, a person at Northampton?—I do not.

Mr. *Bere* stated, that almost all the letters that had been shown to the Witness were country letters.

[*The letter of Francisco Amadio was shown to the Witness.*]

13820. Mr. *Vane.*] Was that letter submitted to you for your opinion?—It is quite impossible for me to say; there is nothing on it; there is no mark of mine on it.

13821. What opinion should you form of it?—I should not form a very favourable one.

13822. Would you advise the company to allot 50 shares to that person?—I should not, from the character of the thing.

[*The letter of Joseph Amadio was shown to the Witness.*]

13823. Mr. *Bere.*] That is directed to your house?—Whatever letters were directed to us we opened.

13824. Mr. *Vane.*] Was that letter presented to you?—I am not quite certain.

13825. What opinion should you form of it?—The same as the last.

13826. You would not have advised the company to have allotted 30 shares to that person?—No, not if I was asked my private opinion; I can have no other means of saying so than the appearance of the letter; are you going through the whole of the letters?

13827. Mr. *Vane.*] Yes?—I should submit, that it is uselessly occupying my time; I have stated I cannot identify the letters; it is wasting the time of the Committee and my own; you have got my opinion generally; I cannot recollect the names.

13828. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you any other mode whatever of judging as to the character and responsibility of the parties, whose letters were submitted to you for your opinion, than that of the handwriting of the party himself?—Nothing else.

13829. Do you see any names here whose letters were submitted to you [*handing a printed list to the Witness*]; can you tell me the name of any person there whose letter, applying for shares, was submitted to you for your opinion? I never made a note of the names; and I cannot positively say by looking through them.

13830. *Chairman.*] Do you remember any of them?—No, I do not.

13831. Mr. *Vane.*] How many letters were submitted to you?—I mentioned before, about 100.

13832. *Chairman.*] Were they country letters as well?—No, only the town letters.

13833. Mr. *Bere.*] You were stopped in giving an answer; you said, upon looking over the list, you saw the names of many respectable parties?—I did.

Mr. *W. A. Erck.*

6 May 1837.

13834. *Chairman.*] Do you apply that to the country names?—No, to the London list.

13835. Mr. *Brotherton.*] Do you see any names in the list of parties you advised the company not to allot shares to?—I do not think I could answer that decidedly; there might be some.

13836. *Chairman.*] According to the best of your recollection?—I think there is; Gompertz, I think, is one, but I will not be quite positive; I think that is one name I recollect seeing, which I recommended them not to allot shares to; that, I believe, is Gompertz.

13837. Can you tell whether you gave that recommendation to the Committee after the shares had been allotted to him in the country?—No, I cannot.

13838. Mr. *Lushington.*] Are you aware of having committed any error in recommending to the company either to reject or accept applications?—No; I do not conceive that there was any error committed on that point.

13839. You generally found, from the character and expression of the letter submitted to you, you could form an accurate judgment?—I could form an opinion; I should not say a very accurate one; no one can speak accurately.

13840. Mr. *Brotherton.*] Do you know whether the company acted upon your opinion?—In many instances.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Alexander Gompertz* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *A. Gompertz.*

13841. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—Tiverton-street, Newington.

13842. What are you?—I deal in shares.

13843. Do you write letters for them?—Occasionally, I do.

13844. Did you write a letter for and apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Railway?—I did.

13845. For how many shares did you apply?—For 40 shares.

13846. Were those shares allotted to you?—Yes, they were. [*The deed was shown to the Witness.*] That is my handwriting.

13847. Is the whole of that line in your handwriting?—Yes, except the witness.

13848. Did the witness sign his name in your presence?—I should say he did, to the best of my belief.

13849. Where did you sign the deed?—At Charing-cross, at the company's office.

13850. Was the deed read over or explained to you at the time of signing?—I do not recollect; but at the same time let me please to observe, I pretty well knew the contents or purport of it, whether it was read over or not.

13851. *Chairman*] How was it it came to your knowledge?—I knew generally the nature of those deeds.

13852. You presumed this was similar?—Yes.

13853. Did you pay the deposits upon these shares?—Yes.

13854. From whom did you receive the money?—From a person of the name of Charles Bamfield.

13855. Was it with his money or your own you paid the money?—With his money.

13856. What arrangements did you make with him when you received the money from him?—We were to divide.

13857. To divide what?—To divide our interest.

13858. Did he pay you anything for signing the deed, besides dividing the interest?—Undoubtedly not.

13859. Have you since repaid him the 40*l.*?—Yes, I did.

13860. Have you paid the second call of 10*s.* a share upon these shares?—I understood the second call was 1*l.*; I was not aware of the second call of 10*s.*

Mr. *Douglas* stated that the second call was not payable till the 1st of June.

13861. Mr. *Vane.*] Has any application been made to you for the call of 1*l.* a share upon these shares?—There has been an application for a call, I think it was 1*l.*

13862. Have you paid any second call?—No, I have not.

13863. Are

13863. Are you capable of paying the second call?—Through the means of friends, but not otherwise.

13864. Have you friends who would enable you to pay the sum for which you have signed the deed, viz., 2,000*l.*?—Probably I might; I cannot say positively; I have friends who would assist me, but I cannot state any specific amount; my friends are in good circumstances.

13865. Have you a large family?—Yes.

13866. And are in needy circumstances?—At present, I am.

13867. *Chairman.*] What division of interest was it that was to take place?—One half.

13868. He was to advance the capital, and you were to advance the signature?—Not exactly so; Mr. Bamfield was an ignorant man and a man of capital, and I did not possess capital.

13869. Was not it so: what were you to advance beside your signature?—I possessed the letter of allotment; he had no allotment of shares.

13870. You were to advance your signature and the letter of allotment?—Just so.

13871. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you signed the Birmingham and Gloucester Railway deed for 4,000*l.*?—Yes.

13872. Have you also signed the South Western Railway deed for 2,000*l.*?—Yes; 40 shares.

13873. You have also signed other deeds for other sums?—South Durham Railway, 15 shares; that is all I recollect.

13874. What is the amount of the shares?—£.50.

13875. Did you also sign the Thames Haven Railway deed for 2,500*l.*?—I think it was.

13876. Were you a shareholder?—No; but I was to have the call of shares.

13877. Did you pay the deposits upon those shares?—No; nor did I receive any consideration for signing.

13878. You took the chance of their getting up to a premium?—Yes; and upon the express understanding that I should have them by applying for them.

13879. Could you, by your friends, raise 11,000*l.*, the amount of the shares you have subscribed for?—I should say not.

13880. *Chairman.*] Could you raise the instalments?—Probably I might, because after certain instalments are paid the shares become available property, and I could get money upon them.

13881. You would propose to obtain the instalment by raising money upon the security of shares?—Yes.

13882. Have you ever pawned your shares to any parties who are said to be pawnbrokers in shares?—No, I have not.

13883. You do not know of itinerant pawnbrokers who advance money upon shares?—No, I do not; but I apprehend shares to be as negociable as any other description of property in the market.

13884. Mr. *Brotherton.*] Did Mr. Bamfield and you take these shares as an investment, or a speculation?—As a speculation.

13885. You found judgment and he the money?—Yes.

13886. Mr. *Vane.*] The call of shares is sometimes valuable?—Yes, it has been.

13887. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by a call of shares?—Letters of appropriation.

13888. Mr. *Vane.*] You say you signed the Thames Haven deed for 2,500*l.*, and were not a shareholder?—Yes.

13889. But you were to have a call of shares?—Yes.

13890. What is the meaning of it?—At the time I signed this deed the shares were in very great request, and they were running up to a premium, and they were thought very desirable.

13891. You signed this deed partly for Mr. Bamfield; were you to have a call of shares here?—In reply to that, the bankers' receipt was not negociable till you obtained the scrip, and the scrip you could not obtain till you had signed the deed.

13892. *Chairman.*] That was the case in this company?—Precisely.

Mr. *A. Gompertz.*

6 May 1837.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

13893. Where did you make your application, was it in London or the country?—It was either at Northampton or Market Harborough [*A letter was shown to the Witness*]; that is my letter, dated from London.

13894. That was the application you made for 25 shares?—Yes; and another for 15, making 40.

13895. Another application afterwards to the same bankers at Leicester?—That relates to the same.

13896. What has become of the South Western Railway?—It has lost the Bill.

13897. That is extinct for the present?—Yes.

13898. The Gloucester, you spoke of just now, has got the Bill?—Yes.

13899. Did you dispose of your shares in it?—Yes.

13900. At a premium?—Yes.

13901. The Thames Haven, is that in existence?—It has its Bill; it has received the Royal Assent.

13902. Are the shares in it valuable?—I should say not at present.

13903. Have you sold your shares?—I did not make a call for the shares; my name is on the deed, if it is a matter of doubt.

13904. What has become of the South Durham?—It lost its Bill likewise.

13905. All that you are liable for is the Thames Haven and South Midland?—Yes; and the Birmingham, Gloucester and South Midland, they have not got their Bill.

13906. You think by the aid of friends you could pay this sum you have subscribed for to the South Midland?—Yes, no doubt of it.

13907. It is a mistake to suppose you are the Gompertz known on the other side of the water?—I know that individual; I am not that individual.

13908. When you spoke of having some arrangement with Mr. Bamfield, were you to take the profit of negotiating the bankers' receipt in the market?—Nothing of the kind was expressed.

13909. Did you sell your shares?—He sold them, and handed me over my share of the proceeds.

13910. What is Mr. Bamfield?—A boot and shoemaker, and likewise deals in shares.

13911. Is he connected with Northampton?—Very likely he may be; it is a matter of opinion.

13912. But he is a man of capital?—Of small capital.

13913. Is he equal to the payment of 1,500*l.*?—If I may believe what he says, he is.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

13914. Are you aware that Mr. Bamfield has signed a great many deeds?—I am not; there is another deed I omitted to name to you, the Stourbridge and Birmingham.

13915. Mr. *Bere.*] What has become of that?—It is not before Parliament.

13916. And not likely to be?—I cannot say.

13917. Mr. *Vane.*] What is the amount of it?—Twenty shares, at 50*l.* each.

13918. Are you capable of paying any one of these subscriptions?—Not any one myself.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Frederick King* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *F. King.*

13919. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—45, St. John-street.

13920. Clerkenwell?—Yes.

13921. What are you?—A milliner and staymaker.

13922. How long have you resided in that street?—About seven years in that house, and nine years at 46.

13923. Do you know Joseph Aguilar?—No, I do not.

13924. Does Joseph Aguilar reside at 45, St. John-street, Clerkenwell?—He does not.

13925. Have you ever heard of Joseph Aguilar?—Yes. I do not know Joseph; I had his sister, a Miss Aguilar, who has worked for me; she is in my employ.

13926. The

Mr. *F. King.*

6 May 1837.

13926. The sister of a person, called Aguilar; not your own sister?—No.

13927. *Chairman.*] You have a person, named Aguilar, who says she has a brother?—Yes.

13928. His name may be Joseph?—Yes. I may tell you in a few words; it has been asked of me, by those who called upon me, if letters came; I am aware that the sister in my employ has a brother in Jamaica, and she has asked me if any letters should come to my house, or had I any objection to letters being directed for her; I said, "Not the least;" and there have been Jamaica letters and newspapers, and twopenny letters have been delivered to her; and once a young man called to know if there were any letters; that might be the brother, but I am not aware that it was Joseph.

13929. How long ago did she make this request to you?—It might be two years.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

13930. How long has she worked for you?—Longer than that time.

13931. And about two years ago she made a request that letters might be directed to her at your house?—Yes.

13932. You are aware there is a correspondence passing between her and some person in Jamaica?—Yes; because there has been a pile of newspapers come to her directed to Mrs. Aguilar, and there have been letters addressed to Joseph Aguilar.

13933. Have those letters been handed over to the custody of that young woman?—Yes.

13934. She took charge of them?—Yes.

13935. And paid the postage of them?—The letters from Jamaica have always been post paid, but I could ask Mrs. King.

13936. Mr. *Vane.*] Miss Aguilar is in the receipt of a salary?—No; it is piece-work she does.

13937. Mr. *Bere.*] What is your employment?—I am in several employments.

13938. What is the one in which Miss Aguilar is employed?—Millinery.

13939. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know anything of Joseph Aguilar's circumstances?—I do not know anything of his circumstances; I do not know such a man.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *John Edward Stokes* was again called in; and further Examined, as follows:

Mr. *J. E. Stokes.*

13940. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—Hemsley-terrace, Hackney, and Bank Chambers, Lothbury.

13941. What are you?—A stockbroker.

13942. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Railway?—I do not recollect; I do not think I did.

13943. Were any appropriated to you?—Certainly not.

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

13944. Is that your name and handwriting?—It is.

13945. How many shares have you there signed for?—Eighty, I think it is.

13946. Was the deed read over or explained to you at the time of signing?—Certainly not; it was at a tailor's shop at Westminster, up stairs.

13947. At the office of the company, at 19 Charing-cross?—I do not know; merely a tailor's shop was underneath.

13948. Did the witness sign his name in your presence?—I cannot recollect.

13949. Have you signed other deeds?—Yes, a great many.

13950. Did you sign for other people?—I made it a practice to sign for my principals; I never held any shares of my own.

13951. Did you sign for yourself or your principal in this company?—For my principals of course, as I did in other companies.

13952. Who gave you the bankers' receipt for 80 *l.*, the first deposit upon these shares?—I am sure I cannot recollect the particular circumstances who gave me the bankers' receipt, whether I got it at the bankers' or at the company's office. I cannot recollect, it is so long ago, and I was so much accustomed to these things.

13953. Was it with your own money that the deposits upon those 80 shares

Mr. *J. E. Stokes.*

6 May 1837.

were paid?—No, certainly not; it was the money of my principals; it was my practice always to sign for them.

13954. What did you receive for signing for those 80 shares?—I think at that time it was half-a-crown a share I charged; afterwards I only charged 1*s.*; but I think this was one of the first companies, and I charged half-a-crown.

13955. *Chairman.*] This was a regular matter of business?—Yes; my principals were men of property, and they would not sign the deed, because they would not run the risk.

13956. What risk?—Make themselves liable to consequences, I suppose.

13957. Mr. *Vane.*] Are you in the daily habit of jobbing for shares?—Not jobbing; I am a broker.

13958. You are not a jobber, but a broker?—Yes.

13959. *Chairman.*] You mean by that you do not buy and sell on your own account, but on account of others?—I am under a heavy penalty for doing so, for buying and selling on my own account. I only do it on commission.

13960. Did you sign the City of London Railway for 4,000*l.*?—I did.

13961. Did you receive the like commission for signing?—Only for 30 shares, 50 were my own. I was employed by the directors, and had 50 shares given to me.

13962. Did you sign the Westminster Bridge and Deptford for 750*l.*?—Yes, I did.

13963. Did you receive a commission for it?—Yes.

13964. Do you recollect from whom you received that commission for signing the Westminster Bridge and Deptford?—I would submit that, as it was for principals, it would be a great satisfaction to me not to mention the names.

13965. You must give the names?—I cannot recollect the particular parties; I recollect one party; I signed for a great many. Mr. Atkinson, who, I dare say, would have no objection to say so.

13966. Is that Mr. Atkinson a stock-broker?—No; he is not in business, he is of independent property.

13967. Where does he live?—In Hackney Fields.

13968. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you also sign the South Western Company's deed for 5,000*l.*?—I do not recollect the amount, but I did sign that deed.

13969. *Chairman.*] When you sign for other parties and receive a commission for so doing, do you make any entry in your books?—No, I do not do that; I could with some difficulty trace it; I have a regular book of all my transactions, and I might trace it by looking over a parcel; but it was not considered anything in the way of business; we used to get all the shares together, and go and sign for them.

13970. Can you say who it was you signed those 80 shares for, and received commission for so doing?—I remember a part of them was for Mr. Atkinson.

13971. Mr. *Vane.*] How many for Mr. Atkinson?—I think it was 30, because it was a large quantity. I was only subpœnaed last night before I got home, and I have not provided myself with any books; I do not think I could trace the number.

13972. *Chairman.*] Do you remember anybody else but Mr. Atkinson?—Yes, Mr. Williams, I recollect.

13973. Who is he?—An accountant.

13974. Mr. *Vane.*] Does he reside at 37, Old Broad-street?—No, he does not reside there.

13975. Does he reside at Torrington-park, near Hornsey?—No; his nephews reside there, and his brother; but he is to be found at the Polbrou Mining Company. I think it was for him I signed, I am not quite sure.

13976. Did you also sign the deeds of Gibbs's London and Brighton line for 3,400*l.*?—Yes.

13977. Did you receive a commission for it?—Yes, certainly I did; I never did anything without a commission.

13978. Did you sign the Bristol and Exeter for 2,000*l.*?—I think I did; I am not quite sure.

13979. Did you also receive a commission for that?—Yes.

13980. Did you sign the Trinity Harbour Bill?—I do not recollect whether I did; I employed a man to do it.

13981. You employed a man to sign for you?—Not in my name. I received a note

a note from him last night, that he had got that note to attend about his shares; his name is Page; and I shall attend to it for him.

13982. What did you give that man for signing?—I gave him a crown.

13983. Where does he live?—In the City-road.

13984. What did you receive for getting Page to sign for you?—I shall get 1 *s.* a share.

13985. I believe you are an insolvent?—No, I am not.

13986. You are not?—No; for a short time I am out of the Stock Exchange, in consequence of the defalcation of my clerk; I have no objection to state it, it is nothing to my discredit. I have been for the last month off the Stock Exchange, in consequence of the defalcation of a clerk of mine for whom I was security; till I know what he is going to do, and what my own friends are prepared to do, as to my differences, I cannot go into the house.

13987. Do you know most of the jobbers in penny shares on 'Change?—Yes, I know most of them; but I do not trade with them.

13988. Do you know them?—Yes.

13989. Do you know William Dorrington, 9, Harleyford-street, Kennington?—Yes, I know him perfectly well; he was formerly of the Stock Exchange.

13990. Can you say whether he is able to pay 11,000 *l.*?—I cannot speak as to his circumstances; he is a very honourable man, and I would trust him; I know nothing of his circumstances.

13991. Do you know William Wright, 16, Great Charlotte-street, Blackfriars?—No.

13992. Do you know George William Morrison, 56, Basinghall-street?—No.

13993. Do you know William Bamfield, 17, Sweetings-alley, Cornhill, bootmaker?—Yes.

13994. What is he besides a bootmaker?—There are two Bamfields; I think George is a respectable man; he is a dealer in these shares; both of them are, and have been some time; but one of them is insolvent, and has been some time.

13995. Is that William?—Yes, I believe it is; they both lived together; they have now separated.

13996. You say George Bamfield is a respectable man?—One or the other, I do not know which.

13997. Do you think that the respectable man is able to pay 2,000 *l.* by instalments?—Yes.

13998. Do you know Francisco Amadio?—I do not know him personally; I know that he is a dealer in these shares.

13999. Is he capable of paying 25,000 *l.* by instalments?—I should think not; I should think none of these two-penny dealers are able to pay that sum.

14000. Do you know Joseph Amadio?—It is the same thing; they are writers for shares in all these companies.

14001. Do you know John Jackson of 13, Dorset-crescent?—Yes, perfectly.

14002. Does he reside there?—I believe he does.

14003. What is he?—He was formerly on the Stock Exchange; now he is a jobber outside.

14004. Is he capable of paying by instalments 15,500 *l.*?—I do not think he is capable of paying anything of the kind; but he is a perfectly fair dealer.

14005. Do you know Joseph Dandridge of Wood-street, gentleman?—Yes.

14006. What is he?—He keeps a barber's shop.

14007. Is he a jobber in shares?—Yes; and has been ever since I have been on the Stock Exchange; he writes for every company.

14008. Is he capable of paying by instalments 1,500 *l.*?—No, nor 15 *l.* either.

14009. Do you know William Bloxam?—Yes, I do.

14010. What is his proper name?—William Burnett Bloxam.

14011. What is he?—I believe he keeps a public-house now; he was formerly at the Stock Exchange.

14012. Is he capable of paying 7,000 *l.* by instalments?—I do not know; his mother is lately dead, and he has some reversionary property that has lately settled him in business; before that he was not worth 7 *d.*; but his mother, a daughter of Sir Robert Burnett, has died lately.

14013. Do you know R. Brine?—I know him as a regular writer for these companies; I do not know anything of his circumstances.

14014. Is he capable of paying 7,000 *l.*?—I should think he would not be so if he was.

Mr. *J. E. Stokes.*

6 May 1837.

14015. Do you know Charles Fraser, 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road?—Yes, I know him; he is a dealer in shares, and the largest among them.

14016. Is he capable of paying several thousand pounds?—No.

14017. Is he capable of paying 1,000*l.* by instalments?—No, nothing at all; he is very much down, but a very honourable fellow.

14018. Could he raise 10*l.* at the present moment?—I should think he could if it was for a speculation.

14019. Do you know Gustavus Edward Becker or Beckering?—It is Beckers, a Russian name; I have known him a great many years.

14020–21. What is he?—He is now employed on some railroad near Bath.

14022. What was he before that?—Before that he was a great writer for these companies, and a dealer in these penny shares.

14023. *Chairman.*] Has he found it a thriving trade?—No; he has been always in great poverty many years; I have subscribed for him a dozen times at least.

14024. Mr. *Vane.*] Is he capable of paying, by instalments, 2,500*l.*?—No, nor 2*l.*

14025. Do you know John Smith, 174, Fleet-street?—I do not.

14026. Do you know William Hall, 8, Capel-court, City?—Perfectly well.

14027. Where is his place of residence?—I do not know.

14028. What do you know of him?—He is a jobber in stock and shares.

14029. *Chairman.*] Is he in a thriving way, or the reverse?—I should think he is rather better off now than he has been.

14030. Mr. *Vane.*] He is a dealer in penny shares?—I cannot say that; I never saw him deal; I think he is rather better than the generality of them.

14031. What do you know of his circumstances?—I do not know anything of his circumstances; I think he would get credit to the extent of 100*l.* or 200*l.* on the Stock Exchange; I would give him credit as a broker.

14032. Do you know William Cook, 8, Capel-court, Bank?—Yes, perfectly well; he is the father of my clerk.

14033. What is Cook?—I think he is not in any business at all; he has been about the door of the Stock Exchange for many years.

14034. *Chairman.*] Has he made a thriving business of it?—He is exceedingly poor; my clerk used to support him, and give him a shilling or two now and then.

14035. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know William Algernon Lens Peircy?—Yes.

14036. What do you know of him?—He is a young man who has worked himself to become rather a respectable dealer in shares and stock; I should think he is worth 200*l.* or 300*l.*; he has always conducted himself very honourably; very industrious and persevering. He is not upon the Stock Exchange.

14037. Do you know Benjamin Day, of No. 1, Monkwell-street, Falcon-square?—Yes, he is a dealer in these shares.

14038. Penny shares?—Yes.

14039. Is he capable of paying 1,500*l.*?—I should say not.

14040. Do you know Henry Randall, 6, Camberwell-grove?—Yes, perfectly well; he is a principal of mine.

14041. Is he capable of paying 1,500*l.* by instalments?—£.15,000.

14042. Mr. *Lushington.*] When an individual applies to you to procure shares in a railway on his account, though in your name, is it on the understanding that he is to indemnify you for any contingent loss?—No, certainly not.

14043. You do not trouble yourself to inquire into the substance of your employers, provided they pay you the stipulated per centage?—I know their means, if they want shares and employ me, they will not sign the deeds; they will not run the risk, though they are men of property; they get me to sign for them, which I do; they have only a scrap of paper in their hand, and nobody knows anything about it.

14044. If a stranger was to employ you to purchase shares, and gave you this per centage, should you inquire into his circumstances?—Certainly not.

14045. Your object is to get the per centage, and you disregard the risk you run?—Yes; it is regarded as mere matter of form; and it was so in 1825, when I was very largely engaged in these things.

14046. Are there many stock-brokers employed in the same line of speculation as that which you have described?—I should say almost all, only they will not state so; and I would not state so, unless I was compelled, by being called here.

14047. And

14047. And this plan is commonly practised?—Yes; I could show you my alphabet; I have nearly a hundred principals; they are very respectable; and none of them will sign the deed, though they have dealt in thousands and thousands of shares.

14048. Mr. *Forster.*] Does any document pass between you and your principal?—No; it is only word of mouth.

14049. If you should incur any loss in consequence of signing, you have no means of recovering?—No; only from their honour; no legal means.

14050. *Chairman.*] Suppose you have signed the deed, you hand over the scrip to your principal?—I do.

14051. Then suppose the Act to be obtained, what takes place afterwards; are you who have signed the deed, or is the party who holds the scrip, the person entitled to register, under the Act of Parliament, his shares?—The person having the scrip; it is his property if he wishes it; and if it is a total loss, they put the scrip into the fire, and pay no instalments.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14052. Are the principals for whom you have been generally concerned men of substance?—Yes.

14053. Do you know the principal for whom you sign this deed?—I signed this deed for several; I collected the shares together, and signed for them all.

14054. Look at that bankers' receipt, and see if that is not one [*handing a paper to the Witness*]?—Yes.

14055. Look at the amount?—£.50.

14056. You signed for 80*l.*?—Yes.

14057. And another you signed for 30*l.*?—They may be for 20 people.

14058. Take that 30*l.* receipt in your hand, and tell me, if you can, from whom you procured that 30*l.*?—I cannot tell.

14059. What is the date of the bankers' receipt?—The 29th of March 1836.

14060. For 30*l.*?—Yes.

14061. Do you know Richard Pearson?—I do not.

14062. Do you know Mr. Clay?—I do not.

14063. Do you know Robson?—Perfectly well.

14064. Did you receive it of him?—No, certainly not; he is a jobber; they may have passed through my hand, if I bought them of him.

[*The bankers' receipts of Messrs. Esdaile were produced, dated 29th March, for 30l.; and another for 50l., dated the 26th March.*]

14065. At the time you signed the deed you endorsed them in your name?—Yes, it appears so.

14066. Upon paying that you received the scrip?—Yes.

14067. And handed it over to the principal?—Yes, or kept it on their account; I am not sure which.

14068. Are you carrying on business at Bank-chambers now?—Yes.

14069. And have been some years?—Yes.

14070. And have been a broker to some extent?—Yes, in former years, not now.

14071. And very largely concerned in business?—Yes, in 1825.

14072. Did you survive that crisis in your credit?—Yes.

14073. Are you well known in the city?—Yes; I dare say I am well known; I have been so many years a broker.

14074. You have spoken of having signed a good many deeds; did you sign the London and Birmingham?—I did not.

14075. The Liverpool and Manchester?—I think I did; I am not sure; I had 100 shares in it; whether I sold them as scrip shares or not, I cannot recollect.

14076. I may ask you generally as to railways that have received the sanction of Parliament, have you signed most of those deeds?—I have signed several.

14077. That have received the sanction of Parliament?—I cannot mention any at present.

14078. Did you sign the Great Western?—I really cannot tell; I had 20 shares in the Great Western; very likely I did sign.

14079. Those are even now at a premium?—Yes, at four premium.

14080. An honourable Member asked you whether the practice of a broker signing for his principal is not of considerable extent?—Yes.

Mr. *J. E. Stokes.*

6 May 1837.

14081. Is it not carried on by brokers of eminence?—Yes, I believe it is.

14082. *Chairman.*] Do you know that it is in cases besides your own?—No, I do not; I do not interfere with other people's business.

14083. Mr. *Bere.*] You said you had seen the names of penny jobbers to deeds, have you seen the names of other brokers, besides yourself, to deeds?—No, I have not; I never look at the deed except to sign my name.

14084. I understood you to say that those persons whose names were mentioned to you were jobbers, from having seen their names?—No; from seeing them in the list of applications for shares.

14085. *Chairman.*] Do you know of any persons, brokers, besides yourself, carrying on extensively, as it appears you do, the practice of signing deeds for other parties upon commission?—Certainly not. I never interfere with other brokers' business; it is a matter of delicacy with us; I never go into a broker's counting-house.

14086. Mr. *Bere.*] When you spoke just now of knowing that those persons you called jobbers had signed, had you any more information regarding them than in regard to the honourable brokers you have been just asked about?—The information I have is in seeing their names in the lists of applicants for companies; and in those lists you find very few brokers, hardly any; for very few men of property apply for shares; they buy them afterwards; after they come out.

14087. In what company have you seen a list of persons who have applied for shares?—A great many.

14088. Tell me one; did you ever see the list in this case?—No.

14089. Tell me one?—I was here the other day, and saw the list of the City Railway.

14090. I mean the lists of applications?—Yes.

14090*. Any other?—I have not got a list of the companies now, but a great many.

14091. Have you any means of knowing whether shares were appropriated to those parties?—In some cases where I have been employed; to say to whom they ought to be allotted.

14092. Have you been consulted in many cases?—Yes, a great many.

14093. How do you form an opinion?—The lists are almost all the same in all the companies, and I pretty well judge from the appearance of the list.

14094. Do you ever judge from the character of the handwriting?—Yes; and likewise I can trace those who write in ten or a dozen names.

14095. When a letter of application is shown to you, can you, as a broker, and well acquainted with the city, judge whether the writer of it is a *bonâ fide* applicant, or a mere speculator?—Yes, I think I can, more than anyone else in the city.

14096. You spoke just now of Mr. Amadio; does he carry on business as an optician?—I do not know; I only know him as a letter-writer.

14097. Do you know the nature of his business?—No.

14098. When you spoke of neither of them being able to advance a sum of money, did you generally answer it without a knowledge of their circumstances?—I do not think I gave such information as to Mr. Amadio.

14099. You said, most distinctly, that they could not advance 2,500*l.*; I understood you to say so?—I think not personally.

14100. They are persons carrying on trade in the city?—I do not know them personally.

14101. All you know is, you have seen their names as applicants for shares?—Yes, regular applicants.

14102. Does the answer you have given me, as to Mr. Amadio, apply to many other persons that you only know as applicants for shares, and do not know the business they carry on?—I have given answers to every name put to me; I considered that no man would write in that way, if he had property; from the circumstance of their writing for every company, I considered they were not able to pay 2,500*l.*

14103–4. Do you know anything of Mr. Amadio's circumstances?—I do not.

14105. Do you know his shop?—No.

14106. Do you know the trade they carry on?—No.

14107. Do you know how long they have carried it on?—No.

14108. You spoke just now of Burnett Bloxam; you say he is now in possession

sion of some reversionary property upon the death of his mother?—I know he was entitled to it; he told me so. Mr. *J. E. Stokes.*

6 May 1837.

14109. Was he living with his mother before she died?—No.

14110. Where was the mother living?—At Foot's Cray, I believe; somewhere there.

14111. Do you know anything of his mother's circumstances?—She was the daughter of Sir Robert Burnett, and she had a life-interest in it; I do not know how much.

14112. Was it land?—I do not know.

14113. Property?—I do not know what it was.

14114. She had an interest in her life; do you mean that?—I do not know.

14115. Was it in some property?—Yes; I do not know what it was.

14116. How long has the mother been dead?—I do not know.

14117. Is it 12 months?—I do not know; I have no interest in it.

14118. *Chairman.*] Are you aware whether William Bloxam has been in the habit of writing for shares in different names?—Yes, quite sure of it; he writes in the name of Burnett and Bloxam, and reverses the names several times.

14119. Mr. *Bere.*] How do you know it is the same person?—He has admitted it to me.

14120. He does not conceal it?—No.

14121. You know him by both names?—Yes; I have known him 15 or 16 years.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

14122. Have you ever seen letters of his written in different names?—Yes, I have.

14123. For shares in the same company?—Yes, in companies in which I have been interested.

14124. How do you know that he is entitled to any property from his mother?—Only what he told me.

14125. Have you ever heard that that property goes away from him?—I do not know any more than he told me he was entitled to some property.

14126. Mr. *Forster.*] Is William Bamfield a well-informed or an ignorant man?—Extremely ignorant; I should think he was hardly able to write his name.

[The Witness withdrew.

John Spear was called in; and Examined, as follows:

14127. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—No. 34, Clerkenwell-green. *John Spear.*

14128. What are you?—Why, I am an agent.

14129. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by an agent?—In the share line.

14129*. Mr. *Vane.*] How long have you resided in Clerkenwell-green?—Not long, only since Christmas.

14130. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Railway?—No, I did not. (*The deed was shown to the Witness.*) That is my writing.

14131. Is the sum in your writing too?—"Twenty shares," that is mine, and the "1,000*l.*"

14132. Where did you sign that deed?—At Charing-cross, at the office.

14133. Who was present when you signed it?—I rather think it was the secretary; there was nobody else but him present.

14134. Did he sign his name in your presence?—I rather think he did, to the best of my recollection,

14135. Was the deed read over or explained to you before you signed it?—Certainly not.

14136. *Chairman.*] Have you any knowledge of the usual contents of such deeds?—I cannot say that I ever read one.

14137. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know the contents of this deed generally?—I never read one.

14138. Is the place where you are residing now a coffee-shop?—It is a coffee-house.

14139. As you never applied for shares, how did you come in possession of the bankers' receipt for those 20 shares?—I was asked to sign by a gentleman who

John Spear.

6 May 1837.

who held those receipts; they were country receipts; I rather suppose that the parties objected.

14140. *Chairman.*] Who was this gentleman?—I was asked by a Mr. Robson, of the Stock Exchange.

14141. Mr. *Vane.*] What is Mr. Robson?—A very respectable stockbroker.

14141*. Did he give you the receipt?—Yes, he did.

14142. *Chairman.*] What passed between you and him?—Merely that he wished me to go and get those bankers' receipts exchanged for scrip certificates.

14143. Did he give you any reason why you, and not he, should do it?—No, he did not.

14144. When did this conversation between you and him take place?—It was about 10 months ago.

14145. Where was it?—At his own office.

14146. Where is that office?—I think they call it Capel-court, close to the Stock Exchange.

14147. Did he ask you to sign the deed for him?—Yes, certainly.

14148. Did you go to the office and sign the deed?—Yes, certainly.

14149. Did he tell you you should have anything for signing for him?—He said he would remunerate me in some way, or would satisfy me.

14150. Tell us what he gave you for signing the deed?—I think it was 1 *l.*, to the best of my recollection.

14151. Did you receive that 1 *l.* at one payment, or in several payments?—I think three or four payments.

14152. Why did he not pay you the 1 *l.* at one time?—Because I was obliged to come up three different times before the thing was accomplished, in consequence of the provisional committee not being at that time met, because a gentleman in the office I presumed to be the secretary, did not feel justified in allowing me to sign the deed without their consent.

14153. Did he give any reason for not allowing you to sign?—He merely said the provisional committee would be in town in a few days, and he wished it to stand over till they arrived.

14154. Did he ask you whether you had applied for shares?—No, he did not.

14155. Have you not signed other railway deeds?—I signed the South Western.

14156. It that for 3,250 *l.*?—I do not exactly recollect the number of shares.

14157. Did you receive any money for signing that deed?—Yes, I did.

14158. Who paid you?—The same party.

14159. Do you consider yourself competent to pay 4,250 *l.*, if called upon, by instalments?—Certainly not.

14160. There will be a call of 10*s.* per share due on these 20 shares on the 1st of June, are you competent to pay that call; it would be 10 *l.*?—I cannot say I am in a situation immediately; it is very possible I might be.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14161. I understand you signed the South Midland Railway Company at the request of Mr. Robson?—Yes; he wished me to do it.

14162. Mr. Robson is a respectable broker in the city?—Yes, he is.

14163. A man of wealth and respectability?—Yes.

14164. And you produced those two bankers' receipts to the company (*handing two papers to the Witness*)?—Yes, I believe those are them.

14165. Just attend to my question, and before you give me an answer, think for a moment, will you. Upon your presenting those receipts to the secretary, did not the secretary say to you, are these your own?—Yes, he did.

14166. Did you not assure him that they were?—Yes, I did; that is true; I considered myself bound to do so, or I should not have been able to obtain the scrip from Mr. Robson.

14167. After that, did not the secretary tell you he should wish to consult the directors before he allowed you to sign?—That was for the whole 35.

14168. He told you he wished to consult the directors before you were allowed to sign?—Yes.

14169. Did you not frequently apply to the office after that, asking permission to sign the deed?—Three times, in all.

14170. Did not an interval of nearly three months elapse from the time of your

John Spear.

6 May 1837.

your first application, till you were allowed to sign the deed?—Not so long as that.

14171. Two months?—About five weeks.

14172. You ultimately signed for 20 shares?—Yes.

14173. You took the scrip back to Mr. Robson?—Yes.

14174. And delivered it to him?—No, he was out of town; I delivered it to a gentleman who acts for him.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

14175. You first applied to sign the deed for 35 shares?—Yes.

14176. Did you apply to sign the deed for 20 shares only?—No; 35.

14177. After you were refused to sign for that, did you ask to sign for 20?—The secretary told me he would allow me to sign for 20.

14178. Mr. *Bere.*] When was that?—It was the third time I went to the office.

14179. What became of the other 15 shares?—He recommended me to get some friend to sign for the remaining 15.

14180. What passed between you and the secretary; what were his words; can you recollect?—He merely stated that the provisional committee had not yet arrived; and after my being there three different times in the space of about five weeks elapsing, in the meantime he would allow me to sign for the 20, and I had better get some friend to sign for the 15.

14181. Mr. *Bere.*] Did you procure your friend to come and do it?—Yes.

14182. Who was it?—Richard Spencer signed for the 15.

[The Witness withdrew.

Richard Spencer.

Richard Spencer was called in; and Examined, as follows:

14183. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—27, Baldwin-street, City-road.

14184. What are you?—I am out of a situation.

14185. Are you a jobber in shares?—I am so.

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

14186. Is that your name and handwriting?—It is so.

14187. I see you have there described yourself as a surveyor?—I do so.

14188. Have you ever been a surveyor?—No, I have not.

14189. Did you apply for shares in this company?—I did not.

14190. You have signed the deed for 15 shares?—Yes.

14191. Did you pay a deposit upon the 15 shares?—No, certainly not.

14192. Of whom did you get the bankers' receipt for the deposit?—From the clerk at No. 19.

14193. From whom did you get the bankers' receipt?—From Mr. Williams, I think; from Mr. Spear, I mean.

14194. Were you aware, when you signed the deed for 15 shares, you were making yourself liable for 750*l.*?—I cannot plead ignorance to that.

14194*. *Chairman.*] What passed between you and Mr. Spear?—I was to sign the deed for a certain sum of money.

14195. Mr. *Vane.*] Who was to pay you that money?—Spear was deputed by another party to pay me.

14195*. Did he tell you by whom he was deputed?—He did.

14196. Name the person?—Mr. John Robson, of the Stock Exchange.

14196*. When you signed the deed did anything pass between you and the secretary?—Nothing at all.

14197. What did you do with the scrip after you had received it from the secretary?—Returned it into Mr. Spear's hand; and I went with him to receive the money which he gave me for signing the deed.

14197*. Of whom did you receive the money?—John Williams.

14198. Who is John Williams?—He was clerk at Mr. Robson's.

14198*. Did you receive it at Mr. Robson's office?—Yes.

14199. *Chairman.*] How much did you receive?—Five shillings.

14199*. Did you see how much it was that Spear received of Williams altogether?—I did not.

14200. Did he tell you?—Yes.

14200*. What did he tell you?—From 30*s.* to 35*s.*, at sundry times.

Richard Spencer.

6 May 1837.

14201. Mr. *Vane.*] There will be a call of 10*s.* a share in this company on the 1st of June next; are you in a situation to pay that call?—I am not.

14202. Have you signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway deed for 1,500*l.*?—Yes, I have.

14203. What did you describe yourself there?—Gentleman, I think.

14204. Did you receive money for signing that deed?—I did.

14205. Did also sign the Deptford and Dover deed for 9,500*l.*?—I did.

14206. Did you receive money for signing that?—Yes, I did.

14207. Should you, by any possibility, be able to pay 12,000*l.*, the sum you have signed for, by instalments, as they become due?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14208. You are a gentleman, are you?—Yes.

14209. You are a gentleman, I understand?—I call myself as such.

14210. Accountant, surveyor and gentleman, which of those honourable appellations do you really bear?—An accountant.

14211. You call an accountant a gentleman?—I cannot say.

14212. When you represented yourself to the South Midland Company as a surveyor, did you mean to practice a fraud upon them?—No.

14213. Why did you represent yourself under false colours?—I was told then to put down surveyor.

14214. Who was kind enough to tell you to do that?—The clerk of the company, who saw me sign the deed.

14215. To put yourself down as surveyor?—To state myself; to put down anything.

14216. To put down your description?—Yes.

14217. That is the gentleman [*pointing to Mr. Gustard*]?—Yes.

14218. You put surveyor?—Yes.

14219. What induced you to put down surveyor there?—There was something said; I must describe myself as gentleman or surveyor, and I chose to put down surveyor.

14220. You thought that surveyor was rather above a gentleman?—No, I did not.

14221. Is that the bankers' receipt you produced upon that occasion [*handing a paper to the Witness*]; your signature is at the back?—Yes.

14222. That is the bankers' receipt you produced upon that occasion?—Yes.

14223. Look immediately under your name; do you see a name that has been erased there?—Yes, I do.

14224. It is not so erased as not to be legible?—No.

14225. Is it John Huddleston?—Yes.

Mr. *Bere* stated that a person of the name of Huddleston was the person to whom these shares had been appropriated at Liverpool.

14226. Where were you when Spear came to you to ask you to sign the deed?—On the Royal Exchange.

14227. Had you known Spear before?—Yes.

14228. What book are you going to refer to?—To minutes of my own.

14229. Of your daily transactions?—Yes.

14230. Did he tell you he wanted some friend of his to go and sign the deed?—Yes.

14231. That the company objected to let him sign for so many?—They did.

14232. Had you known Spear before?—Yes.

14233. Had you known Robson before?—I had seen Robson.

14234. Did Spear tell you he was employed by Robson?—Yes.

14235. You went at the request of Spear?—Yes.

14236. And were paid by Spear;—Yes.

14237. Did Spear accompany you to the office of the company?—Yes.

14238. And you both signed at the same time?—Yes.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

14239. You say the secretary told you to state anything?—

14240. *Chairman.*] What was it the secretary said to you?—That I must give a description.

Richard Spencer.

6 May 1837.

14241. Of yourself?—Yes.

14242. Did he suggest to you any description you should give of yourself, or did you follow your own inclination?—I followed my own advice.

14243. Mr. *Vane.*] Was he aware you were not a surveyor when you signed?—I should think so.

14244. *Chairman.*] Why?—Because I was in very great difficulties at the time.

14245. Why do you suppose he knew it?—He could see it.

14246. Mr. *Bere.*] By your dress?—Yes.

14247. Mr. *Vane.*] Did not Spear tell you that the secretary had recommended him to get somebody to sign for 15 shares?—No, certainly not.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mary Wadham was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mary Wadham.

14248. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—14, Shaftesbury-terrace.

14249. Does the house belong to you?—No, I rent it.

14250. Do you let lodgings?—Yes.

14251. Do you know Edward Ellis?—He has lodged with me three or four times, and he has returned to me again.

14252. When did he return to you?—Three or four days ago; I do not know exactly, as I go out of town myself occasionally to see my sister.

14253. Do you know Mr. Ellis's writing?—No; I cannot write myself.

14254. What age is Mr. Ellis?—That I cannot tell; I think about 17 or 18; I cannot say, it is what I have heard.

14255. Was he present at your house at a party some short time ago?—I cannot tell; I am not always at home.

14256. Was he present when you were there?—He told me, when he does not wish to see visitors, he is not at home.

14257. Was not he at your house at a party when you were present very lately?—I do not recollect that there ever was a party; it was no party; he has never had any party.

14258. Had you any party?—No.

14259. Has he had a friend or two?—No; he has a cousin called Edward Ellis.

Mr. *Bere* objected to the line of examination.

14260. *Chairman.*] Has Mr. Ellis stated anything to you about his age?—No, because it is not my place to know anything of my lodgers.

14261. Mr. *Vane.*] Has he stated anything to you upon the subject?—No; I do not see him once in a fortnight, for I do not attend upon him.

14262. *Chairman.*] Have you any reason to know what his age is?—No.

14262*. Has any person given you any information respecting his age?—He has lodged with his uncle; his uncle is often out of town, and he gives up his apartments to him, and his uncle said, about 12 months ago, that he was a lad about 16; I do not know any more.

14263. What is his uncle's name?—Mr. Roslowen.

14264. Where does he live?—He is gone to Ireland.

14265. How long ago is it he made you that statement?—About 12 months ago; he has been with me off and on.

14266. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you believe he is more than 17 years of age?—I cannot tell.

14267. *Chairman.*] By his look, do you believe he is turned of 21, or under 21?—I do not think he is.

14268. Mr. *Vane.*] What is Mr. Ellis?—He is a clerk.

14269. To whom?—That I do not know; he can tell you when he comes in; he is at liberty now: he is at home.

14270. We could not find him the other day?—He is at home now.

14271. You do not know to whom he is a clerk?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14272. You said he had a cousin called Edward Ellis?—Yes.

14273. Does he lodge at your house occasionally?—No, he goes to his cousin.

Mary Wadham.

6 May 1837.

14274. What is the age of his cousin?—I do not know; I never saw him, and never heard him mention.

14275. Do you know him by sight?—No; I do not know that I ever saw him.

14276. How do you know he exists?—I only know what I have heard the servant girl say.

14277. Do you know where he comes from?—No, I do not.

14278. You do not know what countryman he is?—I believe it is Yorkshire, but I do not know.

14279. How long have you known him?—Nearly 12 months.

14280. Your experience is pretty considerable with mankind?—I do not understand you.

14281. Did you never see a person that appeared 21, that was not above 15?—Yes, I have got a son 21.

14282. Does he look 21?—No, he does not.

14283. Do you think you can judge, with any accuracy at all, whether a man is 21 by his looks?—No, I cannot.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

14284. You say he is the cousin of Edward Ellis?—Yes.

14285. Did he ever give any address to your house?—Not that I know of.

14286. Has he ever had letters directed to him at your house?—I do not know; I do not answer the door.

14287. Do you know sufficiently the ages of persons to distinguish from 17 to 21?—I should not think he was more than 19.

14288. Do you believe him to be not 19?—I could not say.

A letter of application for 60 shares from Edward Ellis, describing himself as secretary to the South Durham Railway, directed to the bankers at Market Harborough, was put in; and,

Mr. *Bere* stated Mr. Ellis produced the bankers' receipt himself, with his name inserted in it, and that there was a corresponding entry in the banker's book.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Stopford Jones* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. Stopford Jones.

14289. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—Liverpool-street, Walworth.

14290. What profession or calling do you follow?—I am a military man on half-pay.

14291. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Railway Company?—I did.

14292. Were they allotted to you?—Yes, they were.

14293. How many?—

[*A Letter was shown to the Witness.*]

14294. Mr. *Bere.*] Is that your letter?—Yes, for 50 shares.

The letter appeared to be dated the 17th of March, addressed to the secretary of the company at Sir James Esdaile's. Another letter, dated the 4th of April 1836, for 40 shares, signed by the Witness, addressed to the same person, was produced, in which references to Mr. Mitchell, to Messrs. Whitmore & Company, the bankers, and to the agents, Messrs. Greenwood & Cox, were made.

14295. Mr. *Vane.*] You signed the deed for 100 shares?—I did.

14296. Were any more than what you applied for appropriated to you?—I think not.

14297. Who told you to sign for 100 instead of 90 that were appropriated?—I received a letter from some party; I remember I paid upon 100 shares, it may have been a letter for 10 shares, I am not exactly certain. I received another letter from another gentleman, who was allotted 10 shares.

14298. Did the secretary tell you to sign for 100 shares?—I asked the secretary; I presented, I think, a receipt for something more than 100 shares, and I signed the deed of my own accord; I received the two bankers' receipts for 100 shares.

14299. *Chairman.*]

14299. *Chairman.*] From whom did you receive it?—The bankers.

14300. Did you pay the money into the bankers'?—Yes, I did.

14301. Was it your money, or that of any other person?—My own.

14302. Did you take the shares on your own behalf, or that of any other person?—My own.

14303. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you hold the shares now?—No.

14304. In this deed you have described yourself as "Gentleman, Hamborough-wharf;" at that time did you reside there?—I was in business there; I was so far doing some matters for Messrs. Parker & Forster respecting machinery; I was there constantly, and it was my city address at the time.

14305. Have you not got another name besides Stopford Jones?—Yes, Thomas.

14306. Do you not usually sign in the name of Stopford Thomas Jones?—No.

14307. Have you ever signed a railway deed in the name of Stopford Thomas Jones?—Yes, I think I have.

14308. Was it the South Western Railway deed for 5,000*l.*?—It may have been.

14309. Are you an engineer in any way?—Yes; I was constructing machinery for Mr. Parker at that time.

14310. Are you concerned in several railways?—No.

14311. Are you a director in any railway?—I am one of the provisional committee of a railway.

14312. What railway?—The Jamaica.

14313. Did you authorize your son to sign this deed for you?—No, not to my knowledge.

14314. Recollect yourself?—I never authorized my son to sign any deed. I think I recollect a note having been written to me by Mrs. Jones in the country about some matter.

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

14315. *Chairman.*] Is that in your own handwriting?—Yes.

14316. You are positive?—Yes; I never authorized my son to sign any paper for me.

14317. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you ever jobbed in shares on the Royal Exchange?—I might have had two or three transactions in some mining companies, and other things.

14318. Had you a capability of paying the sum you are here liable for, as it becomes due, by instalments?—I am not.

14319. Then you are not capable of paying the South Western deed?—I am not.

14320. Have you ever been a defaulter on the Royal Exchange?—Never.

14321. Have you ever been a defaulter on the Stock Exchange?—Never.

14322. Have you ever been a defaulter in any transactions in shares?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14323. You say you are on half-pay?—Yes.

14324. What rank?—Ensign.

14325. You are acquainted with machinery?—Yes.

14326. And capable of constructing it?—Yes, generally speaking; ordinary machinery, a steam-engine, or any alteration of machinery of that description.

14327. Who were you working for at the Hambro' Wharf?—Messrs. Parker & Forster.

14328. What are they?—Very extensive wharfingers; and Mr. Parker has salt-works at Stoke, where I constructed some machinery for him rather extensively.

14329. Am I right in supposing that employments of that kind are rather profitable?—They are.

14330. The application of skill is considerable?—It requires some skill.

14331. And payment is generally in proportion to the skill employed?—I suppose it is.

14332. Would a letter that came directed to you at Hambro' Wharf have found you?—Yes.

14333. Would a letter directed to you as Stopford Jones, have found you without the addition of your other name, Thomas?—Certainly.

[The Witness withdrew.

William Cooke was called in; and Examined, as follows:

William Cooke.

6 May 1837.

14334. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—I reside at Keppel-row, Stoke Newington.

14335. What are you?—A jobber in shares at the Bank.

14336. In penny shares?—Yes, and the funds, and anything.

14337. In penny shares?—Yes; if I can get a farthing by them I job in penny shares, but I do not job in penny shares generally.

14338. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Railway?—I think so.

14339. Do you recollect whether any were appropriated to you?—I am not certain whether 10 were not appropriated to me [*the deed was shown to the Witness*]?—That is my handwriting.

14340. The whole of the line?—Yes.

14341. You signed the deed twice?—Yes.

14342. Do you recollect how many shares you have signed for in this company?—Ten and twenty.

14343. *Chairman.*] Are you the father of Henry Cooke, a clerk in Mr. Stokes's office?—Yes.

14344. Did you state to this Committee on another occasion, you were very poor?—Perhaps I might; if I did not, somebody did for me, I am told.

14345. Is it so?—I am rather poor.

14346. Mr. *Vane.*] You have described yourself as of 8, Capel-court; have you an office there?—I had at the time I signed; I have not now; I had a room there; I had the use of the room.

14347. Was that your address at that time?—I do not recollect; it was Aldgate.

14348. Do I understand this means your address at that time?—No, I suppose it was not; I cannot tell; the other was my address; I paid for the room.

14349. When did you sign the deed?—I cannot tell, unless the deed shows; I suppose it is 12 months ago, or more.

14350. Twelve months ago had you a room at 8, Capel-court?—Yes.

14351. What did you mean by saying you believe it might be Aldgate?—Where I lodged, I mean; I signed there because I had my letters directed there.

14352. Did anybody give you the money to pay the deposits upon the 30 shares?—The last 20 shares were paid up latterly.

14353. By whom?—By me.

14354. From whom did you receive the money to pay these shares?—The last shares I received the money from my son, to the best of my recollection.

14355. Have you any interest in these 20 shares?—No.

14356. Do the shares belong to your son?—I do not know who they belong to; he is a jobber, and might do it for some other person.

14357. Did your son get you to sign the deed for him?—He did.

14358. Did he pay you any money for signing?—No.

14359. Were you aware of the responsibility you were incurring by signing that deed?—I understood from the prospectus, what I read of it, there was no further responsibility after paying up; I changed the scrip for the shares, and paid up a sum of money, I believe.

14360. Was the deed read over to you, or explained to you at the time of signing?—No.

14361. *Chairman.*] Do you hold the shares now?—No, I handed them over to my son.

14362. When?—The same day I received them from the secretary.

14363. Is your son in Whitecross-street Prison now?—He is, I believe.

14364. Mr. *Vane.*] Are you aware you are responsible for 19,950*l.* in different railways?—These railways have no Acts of Parliament; many of the prospectuses tell the shareholders that they are not liable beyond their deposits.

14365. There will be a call of 10*s.* per share in this company on the 1st of June; are you in a situation to pay it?—What I may be in June I cannot tell; if the shares keep up I may be able to pay them.

14366. If the shares keep down?—Probably it may be inconvenient to do it; I may raise the means.

Cross-examined

William Cooke.

6 May 1837.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14367. Does the price of shares in the market depend upon the amount of misrepresentation there may be?—Yes, it may.

[The Witness withdrew.

John Haley was called in; and Examined, as follows:

John Haley.

14368. Mr. *Vane.*] ARE you the person examined on the 21st of April last, before this Committee?—Yes.

14369. Did you state then your name was John or Charles Haley?—John Haley.

14370. Where do you reside?—No. 16, White's-row.

14371. How long have you resided there?—About three months.

14372. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Railway?—No, I did not.

[*A letter was handed to the Witness.*]

14373. Mr. *Bere.*] Is that your handwriting?—No.

14374. Mr. *Vane.*] That is not your handwriting?

Mr. *Bere.* You had better take care of yourself.

The signature seems to be mine.

14375. Mr. *Vane.*] Is it yours?—Yes; I recollect the circumstance now.

14376. Is it your handwriting?—Yes, the signature is, but the other is not; a person of the name of Goodman wrote it, and I signed my name to it.

14377. Be good enough to state the circumstances connected with that letter?—I did not receive any shares; no appropriation was made upon that.

14378. By whom is that letter written?—By a person of the name of Goodman, and I signed it; I wished to have a certain number of shares, and he wrote the letter, and I signed it.

14379. Was it at your request the letter was written?—Yes.

14380. Why did you not write the letter yourself?—The fact is, that he was writing a letter to have shares appropriated himself, and he wrote that at the same time.

14381. In consequence of that letter, were shares appropriated to you?—No; I think I had not any appropriated to me.

14382. You applied for 30?—Yes; I bought the bankers' receipt of a person of the name of Peircy.

14383. William Algernon Peircy?—Yes; after the shares were not allotted to me; I bought the bankers' receipt.

14384. What did you give for it?—Seven shillings and sixpence a share premium, I think.

14385. How long ago was it?—To the best of my recollection, in April 1836.

14386. Then you did sign the deed?—Yes, I did.

14387. You have there described yourself as living at 8, Thomas-street, Mile-end?—It is two doors from where I live now.

14388. Did you live at 8, Thomas-street?—Yes; it is two doors from where I live now.

14389. Is that your name and handwriting to the deed?—Yes.

14390. When you were examined before the Committee the other day, you stated you lived at 8, Thomas-street?—Yes; I had my letter addressed there.

14391. You stated you lived there?—Yes.

14392. Now you say you live at some other place?—Yes; two doors higher up.

14393. Where do you reside?—16, White's-row; the back door comes out into Thomas-street.

14394. What are you?—I am a schoolmaster at present.

14395. Do you deal in shares?—No, I do not at present; I did at that time; I speculated a little then.

14396. Have you signed Rennie's London and Brighton Railway deed, describing yourself as a shopkeeper?—Yes.

14397. Were you a shopkeeper at that time?—No, not then; but I was previously.

John Haley.

6 May 1837.

14398. How long previously to signing the deed?—Two years.

14399. Do you now hold shares in this company?—No, I do not.

14400. Did you sell them at a loss?—I sold them at a loss.

14401. Did you sign the Deptford and Westminster Bridge Railway for 1,500*l.*?—Yes.

14402. Did you receive anything for signing that deed?—Yes.

14403. How much?—Ten shillings.

14404. Have you also signed the South Western deed for 1,500*l.*?—Yes, I signed; but I do not recollect the amount.

14405. Do you recollect the amount for which you signed Rennie's Brighton line?—Fifteen shares.

14406. £.1,250?—I thought it was 750*l.*

14407. You signed the deed twice?—It may be.

14408. You have signed deeds for 5,125*l.*; are you capable of paying that sum by instalments, as they may be called for?—No, I am not.

14409. There will be a call of 10*s.* a share due on your 20 shares in this company, on the 1st of June next?—£.1 a share was written for.

14410. Are you capable of paying that 1*l.* a share?—No; I have a friend that will advance the money, but I am not myself able to do it.

14411. Are you, then, in very needy circumstances?—Not particularly so; in so far, I am not able at present to pay 20*l.*

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14412. You have been examined before this Committee before?—The Committee on another railway.

14413. You were asked whether you were in a situation to take up your shares, and you say you thought you could take them up, as you had friends, and that you thought that they would advance the money; is that true?—Yes.

14414. Just look at the letter again; you say you are a schoolmaster?—Yes.

14415. You teach writing?—Yes.

14416. And are able to judge from a comparison of handwritings; tell me if the whole is not your handwriting?—No; I recollect the circumstances.

14417. Look at the bottom at the words, "In haste;" is that your handwriting, and compare it with the signature of your own name?—I cannot say whether it is or no; I believe "John Haley" is in my writing.

14418. Look at the words "In haste;" do you not believe the whole to be in your writing?—No, I do not.

14419. Who put the letter in at the post-office?—I think I got Mr. Goodman to put it in.

14420. Is the direction your handwriting?—No, it is not; that is his handwriting; I was obliged to go away at the time, and he wrote it for me, that was the circumstance I allude to; he wrote my letter at the time, but afterwards, I think, I signed my name to it.

14421. That is your handwriting at the back of the bankers' receipt?—Yes, it is.

[*A bankers' receipt, dated 26th March, for 20l., was produced.*]

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

14422. You say you would be enabled to pay for those shares, perhaps, through the assistance of your friends?—Yes.

14423. Are you aware of the price of the shares?—I understand they are very low.

14424. If they continue very low are your friends likely to assist you?—It would be a consideration; I should say I should not be able to pay upon them.

[The Witness withdrew.

Archibald Kerr was called in; and Examined, as follows:

14425. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—Robert-street, Hoxton.

14426. What number?—Forty-one.

14427. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Railway?—I believe I applied, but I did not get any.

14428. Did you sign the deed?—Yes.

14429. Where did you describe yourself as residing?—Robert-street, Hoxton.

14430. What number?—Forty-six.

14431. Did you reside there?—No.

14432. Have you ever resided there?—No, it was a mistake; I had just come to live there.

14433. Mr. *Bere.*] It was a mere mistake?—Yes.

11434. Mr. *Vane.*] You have signed several other deeds as residing at 46, and some at 41?—I only signed one more.

14435. Did you pay the deposits upon those shares?—No; the party that I signed the deed for paid the deposits.

14436. Will you be kind enough to state who it was?—Mr. Dalrymple.

14437. Who is that?—My employer, who is since dead.

14438. What was he?—A wine-merchant.

14439. What did he say to you upon the subject?—He asked me to sign the deed in order to get scrip.

14440. Why did not Mr. Dalrymple sign himself?—Because he said he had not time to go up to attend to it.

14441. Did he merely request you to do him the favour to sign, or did he say he would give you anything?—He asked me to do him the favour to sign.

14442. Did you go to the company's office to sign?—Yes, near to Charing-cross; a tailor's shop somewhere.

14443. Did you receive anything from Mr. Dalrymple for your trouble in signing it?—Nothing at all.

14444. Was the deed read over or explained to you?—No, it was not.

14445. Did you know the substance of it?—I did not think there was any responsibility attached to it.

14446. What led you to form an opinion, there was or was not a responsibility attached to your signing it?—I did not think I should be asked to sign it if there was.

14447. It was the confidence you had in your employer that you should not be asked to sign it, if there was any responsibility, which induced you to sign?—Yes.

14448. Were you of age at the time?—Yes.

14449. Mr. *Vane.*] How much more?—About a month.

14450. When were you of age?—November 1835.

14451. Have you not signed the City and Richmond Railway also for Mr. Dalrymple?—Yes.

14452. Were you a shareholder in that company?—Some shares were got in my name for Mr. Dalrymple.

14453. Have you not also signed the South Western Railway deed?—Yes.

14453.* Once for 5,000*l.*, and again for 1,000*l.*?—No, only for 5,000*l.*

14454. For whom did you sign it?—For Mr. Dalrymple.

14455. Have you also signed the London and Falmouth Railway?—No.

14456. Are you aware you are responsible for 11,250*l.*?—I am aware of it now; I was not aware of it then.

14457. Are you able to perform those contracts?—No, certainly not.

14458. Are you in a situation to pay 2,750*l.* by instalments, as it would be called for in this company?—Not at present, I am not.

14459. In the South Western there is also "W. Kerr, 41, Robert-street, Hoxton;" is that yours?—I do not know whether I signed that deed or not.

14460. Is that your name?—No.

14461. Have you a brother or father called William?—Yes.

14462. Do you think it is your father?—I should think it is.

 14463. *Chairman.*]

Archibald Kerr.

6 May 1837.

14463. *Chairman.*] Do you live at your father's house?—Yes.

14464. Mr. *Vane.*] What are you now?—A wine agent.

14465. Are you able to pay the next call of 10*s.* a share, that will be made in June next, on these shares?—No, I am not.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14466. You applied for shares yourself in the South Midland?—Yes.

14467. Did you apply for 65 shares?—I do not know the amount.

14468. Look at that [*handing a letter to the Witness*]?—Yes, that is my handwriting.

14469. You applied for 65 shares?—Yes.

14470. Did you in your letter give a reference to Mr. Dalrymple?—Yes, I did.

14471. In whose employment you then were?—Yes.

14472. No shares were allotted to you at all?—No.

14473. Is that the bankers' receipt you produced [*handing a paper to the Witness*] for 30 shares?—Yes.

14474. You put your address at the back of it?—Yes.

14475. And in addition to the address, 46, Robert-street, you described yourself as of 36, Abchurch-lane; is that the place where Mr. Dalrymple carried on business?—Yes.

14476. That is the other bankers' receipt [*handing another paper to the Witness*]?—Yes.

14477. You obtained both those from Mr. Dalrymple?—Yes.

14478. Was Mr. Dalrymple in a considerable business?—Yes, a very good business.

14479. Was he in a situation to pay that sum?—Yes.

14480. And has left assets to pay it, if he is liable?—I should say so.

14481. You know Mr. Dalrymple's handwriting, is that it [*handing a paper to the Witness*]?—Yes.

14482. Look at that letter; I perceive Mr. Dalrymple rather remonstrates with the company for not sending him any shares?—I believe he did.

14483. When you went to sign the deed you received the scrip; did you mention at the office you were signing on behalf of Mr. Dalrymple?—I do not know that I mentioned it.

14484. You signed it in your own name, as if you were the owner of the shares?—Yes.

14485. Did you represent at all to the company that you came on behalf of Mr. Dalrymple?—No, I do not think I did.

14486. *Chairman.*] Was there any inquiry of who you were?—No.

14487. Upon the mere production of the bankers' receipts, did they allow you to sign?—Yes, they did

14488. Mr. *Bere.*] What did you do with the scrip?—I gave it to Mr. Dalrymple.

14489. Do you carry on any business yourself?—As an agent only.

14490. For wine-merchants?—Yes.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

14491. You state Mr. Dalrymple has left sufficient property to pay the shares you have subscribed for for him, has he given you any deed to release you from your responsibility?—No.

14492. You are aware you remain responsible?—Yes, I suppose I am.

[The Witness withdrew.

Lunæ, 8° *die Maii*, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

John Pocock, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *John Pocock*.

8 May 1837.

14493. Mr. *Vane*.] WHERE do you reside?—Doddington Grove, No. 3.

14494. What are you?—Clerk in a banking-house.

14495. Were you a clerk in the banking-house of Messrs. Esdaile and Company, last year?—Yes.

14496. Did you subscribe to the South Midland Counties Railway Company?—Yes, I did.

14497. For 1,500 *l.*?—Yes, for thirty shares.

14498. Did you apply for those shares?—Yes, I did.

14499. They were allotted to you?—They were.

14500. Have you a salary?—Yes.

14501. To what amount?—£. 150 a year.

14502. Are you capable of paying 1,500 *l.*, the sum you have subscribed, by instalments, as they may be called for?—A great deal depends upon circumstances.

14503. Do you know a Mr. Risby, who was a clerk in the house?—Yes.

14504. He subscribed for 6,000 *l.* in this company; do you think he is capable of paying that money?—It is impossible for me to say.

14505. What salary had he?—I am sure I cannot tell.

14506. Had he 100 *l.* a year?—I am sure I cannot say.

14507. *Chairman*.] Did he occupy a station at the bankers' higher than you?—No.

14508. From all you know of the salary usually paid to a banker's clerk, can you say he had a higher salary than yourself?—I am sure I cannot say; he was taken from another banking-house.

14509. Mr. *Vane*.] Do you know whether he has any property in Essex or elsewhere?—No, I do not.

14510. Do you know Henry Drewitt?—I do not know him.

14511. Was he a clerk in the house of Messrs. Esdaile and Company?—Not during my time.

14512. Do you know William Augustus Erck?—Yes, I do.

14513. Are you aware what salary he had at the bankers'?—No, I do not.

14514. Do you know anything of his resources?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere*.

14515. What house are you in now?—Messrs. Stevenson and Salt.

14516. That is another banking-house in the city?—Yes.

14517. Mr. *Forster*.] Was it in the knowledge of the partners of your house that the clerk subscribed to this company?—It was through the connexion that Messrs. Esdaile had with different banks in the country.

14518. I ask you, whether the partners in the house were aware of the clerks having subscribed to this railway?—No, not at all.

14519. Mr. *Bere*.] You were stating it was in consequence of the connection of Messrs. Esdaile and Co., with the country banks; were they the country banks receiving the deposits for this company?—I do not know.

Mr. *John Pocock.*

8 May 1837.

14520. Were you agents for the Messrs. Percivals?—Yes.

14521. And for the bank at Market Harborough?—Yes.

14522. It was in consequence of that you took an interest in this company?—It was.

Mr. *William Burnett Bloxam*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *W. B. Bloxam.*

14523. Mr. *Vane.*] HAVE you any other christian name besides William?—Burnett.

14524. Where do you reside?—Park-street, Regent's-park.

14525. What are you?—I have been a stockbroker.

14526. What are you now?—I am a horse-dealer, and have got some cabs, and am living on some money I have just had left me; 500 *l.*, my mother who died in Abingdon-street, three months back.

14527. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland counties Railway?—I did.

14528. For how many shares did you apply?—That I cannot carry in my recollection; I have applied for several shares, I wish I had never applied for one; I have lost a great deal of money by it; I was advised to apply by a friend of mine.

[*A paper was shown to the Witness.*]

That is my writing; it was for twenty shares, I believe.

14529. You have subscribed the deed for 140 shares?—Yes, I did, I believe, for Mr. Northover in the Stock Exchange; as respectable a man as ever lived in the world: there were twenty of my own, I paid up, and I think the remainder was for him; I am not certain, I think it was for Mr. Northover.

14530. *Chairman.*] Mr. Northover is a member of the Stock Exchange?—I believe he is; I have been out of the Stock Exchange some time; I lost 3,800 *l.* in one day by bad debts, when a Mr. Goldsmid cut his throat; and the committee of the Stock Exchange will tell you the same thing; they owe me 8,000 *l.*

14531. Mr. *Vane.*] What was your authority for signing the 140 shares?—I had no authority for doing it, I did not know there was any responsibility; I saw others do it, and I did it.

14532. *Chairman.*] What passed between you and Mr. Northover?—I hardly know what did pass between us; he said, "Bill, are you going up to sign for your shares; will you sign for mine?" I said, "I have no objection, I will sign for you;" but mind you, he gave me a sovereign, or something of that sort.

14533. Mr. *Vane.*] For your trouble?—Yes, for going up to Charing-cross, I think it was, where the South Midland deed was.

14534. *Chairman.*] Did you go there?—Yes.

14535. What passed when you arrived there?—That I cannot tell; I signed the deed.

14536. Mr. *Vane.*] Was any objection made?—No.

14537. Was any question asked whether you signed on your own behalf, or for any other person?—Not to my recollection; no question was asked.

14538. Was any question asked you who you were that came to sign for so large a number of shares?—That I cannot recollect exactly; I know I had no questions asked me, the same as when I signed any other.

14539. You signed your name on the back of the bankers' receipt?—Yes, I did; I wrote it; that is my hand-writing.

14540. Who gave you the bankers' receipts?—Upon my life I do not know; I paid upon twenty myself, and I am not on my oath; that is all, gentlemen; that is my hand-writing.

14541. Mr. *Bere.*] Look at the receipts, you will see some names in pencil; you will know who you got that sum from?—I do not understand the question; I used to job in these things.

14542. Mr. *Vane.*] From whom did you get those receipts?—I do not know; I might have jobbed in 500 shares, which I dare say I have; I was there as a common jobber in the shares.

14543. *Chairman.*] When did you cease jobbing?—Out of doors or in doors, do you mean?

14544. Out of the Stock Exchange?—I found it a losing game, and left it, about

about nine months back; I found with a little money there I could never get paid, and it was of no use paying other people.

14545. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you not been in the habit of signing and giving different names and descriptions?—Only my own name; I have written in the name of Burnett and Bloxam.

14546. Have you ever signed any deed in the name of William Burnett only?—Yes, I did.

14547. Have you ever described yourself as residing at Broad-street-buildings, wine-merchant?—Never; I was not a wine-merchant; I used to direct my letters to my brother, who is a wine-merchant.

14548. I see in the Brighton and Shoreham list William Bloxam, 40, Broad-street-buildings, wine-merchant?—No, not wine-merchant; you cannot show me my hand-writing of that.

14549. Have you signed the City of London Railway for 1,750 *l.*, and also for 750 *l.*?—I signed for myself for my own shares, and a clerk came up and asked me, Mr. Gethen, "You have written in the name of Burnett;" I said I had, and signed it in the name of Burnett.

14550. You have also signed the London, Brighton, and Shoreham Railway for 500 *l.*?—No, not to my knowledge.

14551. Did you sign the South Western deed for 4,750 *l.*?—Yes, those are all lists for the shares; I had no idea that there was anything in regard to the amount; you astonished me by the amount.

14552. You have signed the Chester Junction for 1,000 *l.*?—I may have done it.

14553. Have you signed the Chester and Crewe?—Just mention the shares; I do not understand the amount.

14554. Have you signed the Chester and Crewe for 10 shares?—I might have done so.

14555. Have you also signed for 80 shares in Gibb's London and Brighton Railway?—Yes, all my own shares that I sold; I have got 30 at home now.

14556. *Chairman.*] Do you mean this, that you applied for them, and they were allotted to you?—Yes; I have lost a deal of money, and I wish I had had nothing to do with them.

14557. Mr. *Vane.*] The total amount is 17,000 *l.*, are you capable, or do you think you shall be able to pay that by instalments as they become due?—No; I lost my mother the other day, and I have been paying my legal debts; I was told that the moment you sold the things they were out of your possession.

14558. There will be a call of 10 *s.* a share on those 140 shares, the first of June next; shall you be able to pay that call?—I am sure I cannot tell.

14559. Are you able to do it now?—No, I have not the means.

14560. You said you had failed at the Stock Exchange?—Yes, by bad debts: I have 9,000 *l.* owing to me, and which Mr. Pansem will show you; I have been bowled down with bad debts; I have been always used to carriage and horses, just as any of you would be, and I was ruined by my brother, and the Stock Exchange owe me 8,000 *l.*

14561. *Chairman.*] Have you sold your 140 shares in the South Midland?—Yes; only 20 belonging to me; when I signed for more I was not on the Stock Exchange.

14562. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you sell them at a premium or at a loss?—At half-a-crown loss I think, but I will not say unless I could look at my jobbing book.

14563. At Charing-cross did they give you the scrip upon the shares?—Yes, they did.

14564. What did you do with it?—The twenty I had sold on my own account for time, and the others I delivered back to Mr. Northover; I think it was he asked me to come up and sign for him; I wish to do everything honourable.

14565. Mr. *Vane.*] Are you able to meet your engagements?—I will pay for my own shares, but not for the others; I will not pay for other people.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14566. Are you able to pay your calls upon the twenty shares?—Yes, I think I may.

14567. You applied for twenty shares?—Yes, I did, and that is my letter.

The letter appeared to have the post-mark of March 1836.

Mr. *W. B. Bloxam.*

8 May 1837.

14568. You speak of having been advised by a friend closely connected with Glyn and Company, to apply for shares?—Yes; it was a friend of mine advised me to apply, which I did; I do not remember the names.

14569. Did you make another application?—Yes, I did, which was refused.

14570. How many did you apply for the second time?—Twenty-five.

14571. When you went to sign, did you produce the bankers' receipts for the whole amount of shares you signed for?—I did.

14572. And you signed your name at the bottom?—Yes, I did.

14573. Bloxam is your surname?—Yes.

14574. When did you sign the deed; do you recollect?—I do not recollect.

14575. Was it the day you received the scrip?—No; we had been jobbing long before that.

14576. Did you sign the deed the same day you received the scrip?—Yes, when I gave up the bankers' receipt.

14577. And you signed the deed then?—Yes.

14578. Was not it in the spring of last year?—It was.

14579. You said, as to a portion of these you were requested to sign for a stockbroker?—Yes; I think it was Mr. Northover; I cannot say, if I was upon my oath; I could say if I had my book.

14580. Is Mr. Northover a respectable broker in the city?—Upon my life I do not know; he is a friend of mine, but I cannot answer for any man; you know what a stockbroker's life is; he may be rich to-day and poor to-morrow.

14581. *Chairman.*] Is there any other person you think you may have signed for?—No, I think not.

14582. Mr. *Bere.*] Did you intimate to the company that you came to sign on behalf of any other person?—No.

14583. Did you happen to tell them the shares were your own?—No; I was not asked it.

14584. Did you not volunteer it?—The shares were my own as long as I had them in my possession.

14585. Did you not volunteer to tell them that they were your own?—I was never asked the question.

14586. Did you not say so without being asked?—I am almost sure I did not.

14587. Are you quite sure?—No; I put down the receipt and received the scrip.

14588. Without being asked the question, did you not say they were your own shares?—I might have said that they were mine while they were in my own possession, but I would not say so upon my oath.

14589. You had better have more regard to truth?—I am a respectable man, though not rich.

14590. Have you some property?—It was in the possession of Messrs. Bloxams; a gentleman you may know had the money, and I made a bond with him.

14591. Are Messrs. Bloxams, the respectable solicitors, any relation to you?—They are my own cousins.

14592. And some people who are distillers?—Messrs. Burnetts, at Vauxhall.

14593. Are they relations of yours?—Yes, uncles of mine.

14594. Highly respectable?—Yes.

14595. You say you were told there was no liability?—Yes.

14596. Did you learn that at the office?—No; I had signed lists for loans, but was never troubled in my life for them.

14597. Foreign loans?—Yes, since I was a boy of 18; I have signed, and Messrs. Rothschilds will give me a good character.

14598. You signed at Messrs. Rothschilds'?—Yes; not for other people, but only for myself; it does not require signing, only sending in letters.

14599. Up to what time may you have been received as a subscriber for loans?—Mr. Rothschild was kind enough to give me, being a poor man, and having failed, he gave me 3,000 *l.* in the last loan, and I got 90 *l.* by it.

14600. Mr. *Forster.*] That was two years since?—Yes.

14601. You have been off the Stock Exchange since 1836?—Yes; but I have been doing business since.

14602. You said when you heard the sums you were startled?—Yes; I never knew anything of that.

14603. You only thought of the shares, you say?—Yes.

14604. Was

Mr. *W. B. Bloxam.*

8 May 1837.

14604. Was not the sum mentioned at the same time?—I put down 1,000 *l.*, but I thought it was a nominal thing.

14605. You signed your name to the deed?—I saw the 1000 *l.* or 500 *l.* on the deed.

14606. In your own handwriting?—Yes, I believe I did.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

14607. When you signed for Mr. Northover, did he give you any indemnity on your incurring this responsibility for him?—He said, (I will tell the truth), he said, "Bill, if you will go up and sign for me, I will give you a sovereign."

14608. Did he say he would hold you harmless from any responsibility?—No; nobody thought of it for a moment; the moment the shares were out of the possession of the jobbers they thought they were not liable; that is where it is.

14609. *Chairman.*] Have you not given your address at Merton Cottage, Surrey; Broad-street Buildings; 104, Upper Seymour-street, and 96, Park-street, and described yourself a gentleman in some, in others as a stockbroker, in others as a wine-merchant, and in others as esquire?—Never a wine-merchant. I have lived in all the places, and paid rent and taxes.

14610. When did you fail last on the Stock Exchange?—At the time when Mr. Rothschild forced the loan up 7 per cent.; that was about 1832 or 1833.

14611. You have signed all those deeds since your failure?—Yes, I believe; all of them.

Mr. *Frederick Edward Ellis*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *F. E. Ellis.*

14612. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—14, Shaftesbury-terrace.

14613. What are you?—A clerk.

14614. To what?—At a public office.

14615. What public office?—The Admiralty.

14616. At Somerset House?—Yes.

14617. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Railway Company?—I believe I signed for some shares.

14618. Did you apply for any shares?—I am not certain.

14619. *Chairman.*] What is your salary as clerk?—£. 100 a year; not quite 100*l.*, it is 90*l.*

14620. Did you sign as Edward Ellis?—I am not certain.

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

14621. Is that your name and handwriting?—Yes.

14622. Read what is in your own handwriting?—"Edward Ellis, 14, Shaftesbury-terrace, gentleman, 110 number of shares, 5,500 *l.*"

14623. Is all that in your handwriting?—Yes; I believe it is all in my handwriting.

14624. Mr. *Vane.*] How came it you signed Edward only?—I do not remember.

[*A paper was handed to the Witness.*]

14625. Mr. *Douglas.*] Is that your handwriting; that is an application to Sir George Robinson?—No; that is not my handwriting.

14626. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you think you applied for shares?—

[*Another paper was handed to the Witness.*]

14627. *Chairman.*] Is that your handwriting?—Yes.

14628. Just state what it is?—It is a letter to Messrs. Goddard for 60 shares, addressed to the South Midland Railway.

14629. On the back of the letter what is the address?—Messrs. Inkersole and Goddard.

14630.] Mr. *Vane.*] You are sure you applied for 60 shares?—Yes.

14631. How many shares were allotted to you?—I do not know.

14632. When you signed the deed, did you produce the bankers' receipt for 110 shares?—I got certificates given to me from the person who witnessed my signing it.

14633. What did you produce before you were allowed to sign the deed?—I do not recollect.

[*Two papers were handed to the Witness.*]

14634. Mr. *Douglas.*] Were those the bankers' receipts you produced?—That is my handwriting; Edward Ellis, 14, Shaftesbury-terrace.

14635. Mr. *Vane.*] Is the whole of the letter in your own handwriting that was

Mr. *F. E. Ellis.*

8 May 1837.

shown to you just now?—" To sign," is not in my handwriting; I am not certain whose it is.

14636. In whose presence did you write that letter?—Edward Watson Ellis.

14637. Is that Edward Watson Ellis, of 26, Mortimer-street?—Yes, the same.

14638. Of Leicester?—No.

14639. Mr. *Vane.*] You note that at his instance?—Yes.

14640. Does he live there now?—No; not now.

14641. What is he?—He is a gentleman; he is an attorney; that is his profession.

14642. Where does he live?—He is not in town now; I cannot say where he is.

14643. Mr. *Vane.*] How long is it since he left there?—I think about last July he left; I am not certain.

14644. *Chairman.*] When did you see him last?—About two or three weeks ago; I am not certain.

14645. Mr. *Vane.*] Will you be kind enough to account for the reason that you write a letter in the name of Edward Ellis, and signed the name in the deed Edward Ellis, your name being Frederick Edward Ellis?—No; I cannot account for it.

14646. Did Edward Watson Ellis tell you to write in any other name than your true Christian name?—No; I do not think he did; one letter is Edward Ellis, but that is not my handwriting; and one Frederick Ellis.

14647. *Chairman.*] The letter applying for sixty shares is your writing?—Yes.

14648. You signed the deed in the name of Edward Ellis?—Yes.

14649. What is your age?—Sixteen.

14650. What relation are you to Edward Watson Ellis?—Cousin.

14651. What is his age?—Three or four-and-twenty.

14652. Mr. *Vane.*] You cannot account for having signed in those names?—No.

14653. You are quite sure that Edward Watson did not tell you to write and sign those names?—I cannot recollect.

14654. Will you undertake to say he did not tell you to write in those names?—I cannot remember.

14655. *Chairman.*] Did Edward Watson Ellis have any conversation with you about the way in which you should write for shares?—He told me how to write the letter.

14656. What did he say to you upon the subject?—He asked me to write for shares.

14657. Did he see you write it?—He was at my elbow when I wrote it.

14658. And saw it when you had finished it?—Yes.

The two letters, signed Frederick Ellis, and the signature to the deed, were shown to the Chairman.

14659. Is this letter, applying for sixty shares, in your own handwriting?—Yes; that is in mine.

14660. Is that in your handwriting [*handing another letter to the Witness*] for fifty shares?—No.

14661. Did you sign the deed yourself?—Yes.

14662. Did you also sign the name of Edward Watson Ellis on the deed?—No.

14663. Look at it? [*The Witness looked at the deed*]—No.

14664. You are positive of that?—Yes; certain of it.

14665. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know in whose handwriting those two words " to sign " are?—No; I do not.

14666. *Chairman.*] Are you sure that the letter applying for sixty shares is in your handwriting?—Yes, it is, except the words " to sign."

14667. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know in whose handwriting the letter of the 10th of March is?—In my cousin's, Edward Watson Ellis.

14668. You say you know your cousin's writing; is that his handwriting, Edward Watson Ellis?—Yes, it is.

14669. State in whose handwriting this letter is, dated 9th March 1836, applying for fifty shares?—That is Edward Watson Ellis's handwriting.

14670. And that is in your cousin's, too—[*handing another letter to the Witness*]?—Yes.

It appeared that the letter of the 10th of March 1836, dated Admiralty, Whitehall, applying for fifty shares, was in the handwriting of Edward Watson Ellis, but signed Frederick Ellis. It also appeared that a letter dated 26, Mortimer-street, Cavendish-square, dated 9th March 1836, and applying

applying for fifty shares, and signed Edward W. Ellis, was in the handwriting of Edward Watson Ellis, both letters being addressed to the Rev. Sir George Robinson.

14671. Mr. *Vane.*] When you signed the deed was it read over or explained to you?—No.

14672. Did the secretary sign his name in your presence as witnessing it?—I believe he signed as I was leaving the room.

14673. Will you state what passed when you went to the room to sign, and who was present?—My cousin, Edward Watson Ellis, and that gentleman, the secretary.

14674. Mr. Gustard?—Yes; another person came into the room and got some papers, but went out again.

14675. From whom did you receive the two bankers' receipts for 50 *l.* and 60 *l.*?—I never remember having them at all.

14676. Did you pay any money into the bankers'?—No.

14677. *Chairman.*] Did you produce any papers in the shape of a receipt on the day you went to the office to sign the deed?—I cannot remember.

14678. Just look at your signature at the back?—That is my signature there; whether Watson Ellis delivered it I do not know.

14679. Are both of them your signatures?—Yes.

14680. Did those papers pass through your hands on the day you went to sign the deed?—I cannot say.

14681. Who gave you instructions what you were to do on the day you went to sign the deed?—My cousin.

14682. Did he hand to you those papers previous to your signing?—I do not remember.

14683. Have you paid any money at all?—No.

14684. Did you receive an answer to the application you made for the sixty shares?—I do not remember.

14685. Do you remember receiving any answer, informing you that you might have the 60 shares?—I cannot say; I do not remember; I am not certain of it.

14686. If you did receive any such answer, do you remember giving it to your cousin?—If I had received any I should have given it to him; but I do not remember.

14687. In fact, you wrote for shares at the instance of your cousin?—Yes.

14688. Mr. *Vane.*] When you had signed the deed, did you receive any scrip from the secretary?—Yes.

14689. What did you do with it?—I gave it to my cousin immediately after I had left the house.

14690. Did your cousin give you anything for signing?—No; he did not.

14691. *Chairman.*] Did he promise to give you anything for signing?—Yes.

14692. What did he promise you?—£. 5.

14693. Did he pay you that 5 *l.*?—No.

14694. Mr. *Vane.*] Did your cousin sign the deed in your presence?—No, he did not.

14695. Did you see your cousin sign it at the same time?—No, it was signed when I got there.

14696. Was any question asked of you, when you went to sign, from whom you came, or whether you signed on your own behalf?—Not that I remember.

14697. *Chairman.*] Did they remark upon your youthful appearance at the time you went to sign?—Not that I remember.

14698. Mr. *Vane.*] Did anything pass between your cousin and the secretary, or any other person in the room?—I think there was some conversation that I had come to sign, or something of the kind.

14699. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you recollect at all anything taking place; can you speak to it; if you can, say so?—

Chairman.] Tell us all about it?—

Witness.] I do not recollect the words; it was just as I was coming up the stairs; my cousin went up first and I followed him, and there was something passed between him and the secretary; I did not hear it exactly.

14701. Mr. *Vane.*] Did your cousin tell you anything after you had left the room as to what had passed?—No, he did not.

14702. Did your cousin give you any indemnity, or did he tell you you were incurring any responsibility when you signed?—I was rather afraid to sign it; but he told me there was nothing in it, and in about a year or so there would be a

Mr. *F. E. Ellis.*

8 May 1837.

letter come to my lodgings for me, and that I should be gone, or I was to leave my lodgings; that I had nothing to do but to leave my lodgings.

14703. *Chairman.*] Are your parents alive?—My mother is.

14704. Where does she live?—In Ireland.

14705. Mr. *Vane.*] I observe one of these letters is dated from the Admiralty, Whitehall; did you or your cousin ever reside there?—I was a supernumerary clerk there for a short time.

14706. Were you there in March last, when the letter was written?—I was at my cousin's house when that letter was written.

14707. Were you a clerk at Whitehall in March last?—Yes, I was.

14708. Were you to have any other interest whatever in those shares than receiving the 5 *l.* from your cousin?—No.

14709. Any other interest whatever?—No.

14710. *Chairman.*] Then your cousin, on the day you went to sign, went up stairs before you?—Yes.

14711. Did you follow your cousin up into the room?—Yes.

14712. How long were you there?—About 10 minutes.

14713. Did your cousin see you sign?—Yes.

14714. When did you see your cousin last?—About a fortnight or three weeks ago.

14715. Where was it?—In Hart-street, Bloomsbury.

14716. Mr. *Vane.*] Does your cousin now reside in the house of Mr. Cotterill, an auctioneer in Hart-street, Bloomsbury?—No, he does not.

14717. Where does he reside now?—I cannot say.

14718. He has signed the deed for 5,500 *l.*; are you aware whether he is in a position to pay that money, when called upon to do so, by instalments?—I believe he only took the shares for a speculation.

14719. Is he in circumstances to pay 5,500 *l.*?—I cannot say exactly.

14720. Do you think so?—I should say not.

14721. Has he any private income?—Not that I know of.

14722. Have you any idea what his business is worth per year?—He has never practised.

14723. On his own account?—No.

14724. Is he a clerk of some solicitor?—He has left the solicitor he was with.

14725. How long ago?—About a year; I am not certain.

14726. What has he been doing since that time?—He has been the manager of a paper.

14727. What paper?—The Englishman.

14728. What do you mean by manager?—I believe he did write some things.

14729. Do you think he gets 100 *l.* a year for it?—He has given it up, to the best of my belief.

14730. Then what occupation is he at present following?—None that I know of.

14731. How does he support himself?—I cannot say.

14732. Have you ever signed any other company's deeds?—No, none.

14733. Did you sign the City of London deed for 2,000 *l.*?—I signed the deed at Charing-cross, and I believe nowhere else.

14734. Do you know whether your cousin has signed any other deeds; did you ever see him do it?—I know he had a deal to do with railways, but whether he signed deeds I do not know.

14735. Have you ever had anything to do with railways?—Nothing further than this; I believe there was one railway I did not sign; I wrote for some shares in it, but never signed anything.

14736. *Chairman.*] Which was it?—I do not remember the name; it was running down to the mouth of the Thames.

14737. Mr. *Vane.*] Was it the Southend Railway?—Yes, I believe it was.

14738. Had you ever any connection with that company?—In what way?

14739. Had you ever any employment in the office?—No.

14740. Had your cousin any employment in it?—I cannot say.

14741. Do you think you could find your cousin?—I could find his father.

14742. Do you think you could find him?—I think I can give you his address.

14743. What is your cousin's father?—A gentleman.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

14744. A gentleman of property?—He has been.

14745. Where does he live?—Low Harrowgate.

14746. What

14746. What profession is he?—He was brought up as a barrister, but I believe he never practised.

14747. Is he a man of property?—Yes, he was.

14748. Has he lost it?—Yes, a great deal of it.

14749. Does his father live now at Harrowgate?—Low Harrowgate.

14750. Your mother is living?—Yes.

14751. In London?—In Ireland.

14752. How long have you been in the Admiralty?—I was six months in the Admiralty.

14753. *Chairman.*] How long were you at the Admiralty, at Whitehall?—About six months.

14754. Mr. *Bere.*] When did you become a clerk at the Admiralty?—I was a supernumerary clerk to the Admiralty a year last January; for about six months.

14755. Who introduced you into the Admiralty?—As clerk

14756. Yes. Who recommended you; people cannot get in without?—I got in through the interest of my uncle.

14757. Who is your uncle?—Mr. Roslowin.

14758. Is he a gentleman of respectability?—Yes, he is a gentleman.

14759. Of respectability?—Not a gentleman of fortune.

14760. What is he?—He was at the time a clerk in the Chancery offices.

14761. How came you dismissed from the Admiralty?—I was only there as a supernumerary.

14762. Are you now a clerk there?—Yes, at the Admiralty-office, Somerset House.

14763. You are only of the age of sixteen?—I was sixteen last December.

14764. Are you quite sure of that?—Yes.

14765. Where were you born?—What is called Parson's Town.

14766. Near London?—In Ireland.

14767. Are you quite sure you are only seventeen?—I shall be seventeen next December.

14768. Was there any inquiry made as to your age when you became a supernumerary clerk?—No; there was, last year, at Somerset House.

14769. Did you represent yourself to be sixteen?—At the time I was about to be an established clerk I was not quite sixteen.

14770. Did you so represent yourself?—Yes.

14771. Your cousin went with you when you signed the deed?—Yes.

14772. He went up stairs first, and you followed him?—Yes, to the best of my recollection that was the way.

14773. Did you go into the room nearly as soon as he did?—Yes, I believe so.

14774. Was any other person present in the room but the secretary?—There was a gentleman came into the room and went out again with some papers.

14775. With the exception of that person, was any other person in the room but the secretary?—No one.

14776. And upon that occasion were those two bankers' receipts produced?—I do not recollect.

14777. Where did you sign your name?—On a table in the room.

14778. If you signed your name on a table in the room, were not the receipts there?—I did not see them.

14779. Did you sign them without seeing them?—I do not recollect seeing the receipts.

14780. Is that your name on the bankers' receipt?—Yes.

14781. Did you sign it in the room when you signed the deed?—I do not remember.

14782. Do you remember putting your name to them at all?—No.

14783. But it is your handwriting?—Yes.

14784. Do you remember whether you ever read it before you put your name to it?—No, I did not.

14785. Just look at it again; that is one that purported to receive 60 *l.* from Edward Ellis, esq. Do you know any other esquire but you?—That is my cousin, Edward Watson Ellis.

14786. Edward Ellis?—No; I have an uncle abroad, Edward Ellis.

14787. But none in this country?—No, none.

The receipt appeared to be by the Market Harborough bankers, from Edward

Mr. *F. E. Ellis.*

8 May 1837.

Edward Ellis, for 60 *l.*; the other appeared to be the London bankers' receipt for 50 *l.*, on account of the South Midland Railway.

From the bankers' book it appeared, that, on the 26th of March, Edward Ellis paid in 60 *l.*; and on the 28th of March, Frederick Ellis paid in 50 *l.*; and E. W. Ellis, on March 29th, 60 *l.*

14788. Before you went into the company's room at the time your cousin did, I ask you, if you will venture to tell the Committee, whether there was any private conversation between the secretary and your cousin?—My cousin might have said I came to sign the deed.

14789. Was there time to say anything more than that?—I should say not.

14790. Did you not go into the room with him, so that if any conversation had passed, you must have heard it?—If there had been any conversation for two or three minutes, I have no doubt I should have heard it.

14791. Or any conversation for half a minute; do you mean to say your cousin was in the room half a minute before you were?—I cannot say exactly.

14792. Is it not a small room?—It is a room at the top of the stairs, you turn to the right.

14793. A front room or a back?—A back room.

14794. Is not it a very small room, so that if anybody speaks in the room every body else must hear?—Yes.

14795. Just tell me if the signatures on the back of the other two bankers' receipts, are in the handwriting of your cousin?—Yes, they are.

14796. Do you mean that your cousin had not given you those bankers' receipts into your hand before you went into the room?—I do not remember; he told me he wanted me to sign for the shares.

14797. Did he not give them to you, and did you not produce them with your own hand?—I am not certain; I could not swear to it.

14798. Do you not believe that those were put into your hands before you went into the room, and that when you got into the room you produced them with your own hand?—I really cannot say.

14799. You talk about your cousin Edward Watson Ellis not being able to pay 5,500 *l.* Do you know anything about your cousin's circumstances?—I do not know; he has never mentioned to me anything about his circumstances.

14800. *Chairman.*] You may know something about them without his mentioning it to you?—I believe he got some property with his wife.

14801. Mr. *Bere.*] When did he marry?—I cannot say.

14802. What property?—I cannot tell.

14803. What is the amount of it?—I have been told——

14804. By him?—No.

14805. Tell me the amount of it from any information you derived from him?—He never told me.

14806. Do you mean to represent to the Committee that your cousin is worth nothing?—I believe there is some property comes to him when his younger sister is of age.

14807. Is he of age?—Yes, twenty-four.

14808. Is his youngest sister of age?—No.

14809. Do you know the extent of that property?—I have heard it was 2,000 *l.*

14810. Coming to him?—Yes.

14811. Do you mean to say he has no other property?—He has got property with his wife, and I believe he made some money in speculating in the railways.

14812. Is the 2,000 *l.* property he is entitled to in his own right, and not in right of his wife?—Yes.

14813. Independent of that, you think he is entitled to some property in right of his wife?—Yes.

14814. The extent of it?—I have never heard.

14815. Then I ask you how you can venture to say he is unable to pay 5,500 *l.*?—I have been told he has run through some part of it.

14816. Have you been told so by him?—By his wife.

14817. When?—Last year; some time at the end of last year.

14818. His wife volunteered this conversation to you?—Yes; she told me she was afraid he was running through it.

14819. She did not say she was afraid he had run through it; now which was it?—I cannot say.

14820. Is he secretary to the South Durham Railway?—He has something to do with it; whether he is secretary to it now I do not know.

14821. Do you know whether he was secretary to it?—One company he was secretary to.

14822. Was not it the South Durham?—There is another company begun under another name.

14823. Was he secretary to the South Durham at the time this deed was signed?—I cannot say.

14824. You know he was secretary to some railway company?—I think I have heard he has something to do with it.

14825. Have you heard it from him?—No.

14826. Look at that handwriting [*handing a letter to the Witness*]; what is the date of it?—19th March 1836.

14827. Does he represent himself, at that time, as secretary to the South Durham Railway?—Yes.

14828. Do you not believe he was; he applies for sixty shares, describing himself as secretary to the South Durham Railway, addressed Messrs. Inkersole and Company, Market Harborough. Do you know what salary he was entitled to?—No, I do not.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

14829. You say your cousin went up into the room before you; was not there time for him to have some short conversation with the secretary?—When the door was opened he went up stairs, and I stopped to brush my feet, and they could not have conversation for five minutes, certainly.

14830. You have stated that these shares were not your own, and you were not able to pay the subscriptions?—Yes.

14831. Quite unable?—Yes, quite.

14832. Should you be able to pay a call of 10 *s.* a share upon them; 55 *l.*?—The money was paid upon them, my cousin told me, before I signed it.

14833. I am asking you whether or not you will be able to pay 55 *l.* on the 1st of June?—I should be unable.

14834. When does your cousin's younger sister come of age?—I should think she is about my own age.

14835. Can you say, of your own knowledge, that your cousin is not capable of paying 5,500 *l.*?—I know very little about his affairs; I heard he had made some money in the railways; I was told he got some property with his wife, and this money was coming to him when his youngest sister was of age; I know nothing further.

14836. Your cousin lives in private lodgings?—He is in the country now; I do not know what he is in.

14837. In what part of the country is he?—In Yorkshire, I believe.

14838. Mr. *Douglas.*] Is he with his father at Harrowgate?—No, I believe not; he is not with his father.

14839. Mr. *Vane.*] Is he acquainted with John Charles Ord of Nunthorp?—Yes, I believe he is.

14840. Was there any connexion between Mr. Ord and Mr. Ellis in the South Durham Railway?—I think Mr. John Charles Ord was a director, I think of that railway.

14841. The railway you have signed, do you mean?—The South Durham.

14842. Have you ever met John Charles Ord at your cousin's?—Once or twice.

14843. Did any conversation then pass with reference to your applying for shares in this company?—No, I believe not.

14844. You say you think not?—Mr. Ord had some conversation with him; there was some conversation about my applying then.

14845. In this company?—I do not recollect.

14846. *Chairman.*] What was the purport of the conversation?—Something that he had got me to write for some shares.

14847. Did you write in consequence of that conversation?—I wrote shortly after that conversation.

14848. Mr. *Vane.*] You wrote for some shares in this company shortly after the conversation with Mr. Walker Ord?—Yes, I think so.

14849. Was John Charles Ord present at that time?—No.

14850. Was Mr. Walker Ord aware of your age?—I believe not.

 14851. You

Mr. *F. E. Ellis.*

8 May 1837.

14851. You have seen John Charles Ord?—Yes.

14852. Have you ever heard any conversation about this railway with John Charles Ord?—No, never.

14853. Mr. *Douglas.*] Mr. Walker Ord recommended the company, and thought it would be a good thing?—I do not recollect that part of the conversation.

Mr. *James Richardson,* called in; and Examined.

Mr. *J. Richardson.*

14854. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—No. 10, Hart-street, Crutched Friars.

14855. Is that sometimes called Hart-street, Mark-lane?—Very frequently.

14856. How long have you resided there?—Upwards of five years.

14857. Do you know John Enston?—No.

14858. A person has signed the South Midland Counties' deed, called John Ensten, 10, Hart-street, Mark-lane, ten shares. Did such a person ever reside at 10, Hart-street, Mark-lane?—No, never to my knowledge.

14859. Have you ever had letters addressed for that person to your house?—Either that name or Euston; I am not positive which.

14860. *Chairman.*] Did any person of the name of Euston ever live there?—No.

A letter returned through the twopenny post was put in, addressed to Mr. J. Ensten, merchant, 10, Hart-street, Mark-lane, London.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Douglas.*

14861. Is No. 10, Hart-street, Mark-lane, a lodging-house?—No, I keep the house; there are lodgers up stairs, in the upper part of the house.

14862. You take lodgers in generally?—There is one person of the name of Dawson kept it until last Christmas.

14863. Are you the proprietor of the house?—I am the leaseholder of the house.

14864. How long have you resided at it yourself?—Five years, from August 1831, I took possession.

14865. Do you know that handwriting at all [*handing a letter to the Witness*]?—No, I do not.

A letter, signed John Ensten, dated 21st March 1836, from 10, Hart-street, Mark-lane, addressed to Mr. Scriven, of Leicester, was produced, applying for ten shares; and it appeared by the bankers' receipt of the 26th of March he had paid 10 *l.*

Mr. *Douglas* stated, that a letter was written in answer to the letter of application, and that the money was paid in at the bankers, and the bankers would not receive the money without the production of the letter of appropriation.

Witness.] Letters have been left there, I believe, in that name.

14866. Who received those letters?—Mr. Dawson, I believe.

14867. *Chairman.*] Your lodger?—Yes; he occupied the upper part of the house; he left it last Christmas.

14868. Mr. *Douglas.*] Is Mr. Dawson a respectable man?—Yes.

14869. Do you know where Mr. Dawson is now?—He lives 21, Nelson-street, Commercial-road; I believe that is his address.

14870. Did Mr. Dawson ever assume that name, do you know?—Never, I believe, in his life.

14871. But Mr. Dawson took in letters addressed to John Ensten?—I was once requested, if a letter came in that name, to send them to the private door; I sent a person to the private door with one, and there have been a good many letters come afterwards since they have been gone.

14872. What has become of them?—I do not know.

14873. Did you take them in?—No, I never took in any one myself.

Mr. *John Jackson,* called in; and Examined.

Mr. *John Jackson.*

14874. WHERE do you reside?—Dorset-crescent, New North-road.

14875. 14, Dorset-crescent?—Yes; in the New North-road.

14876. What are you?—A stock-jobber.

14877. Did you apply to the South Midland Railway Company for 310 shares?—I did not.

14878. Did you apply for any shares?—I am not sure that I did.

[*The*

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

Witness.] This is my handwriting.

14879. *Chairman.*] Is it all in your handwriting?—Yes, it is.

14880. Mr. *Vane.*] When you signed that deed, did you produce any bankers' receipts?—Of course I did.

[*Some bankers' receipts were handed to the Witness.*]

14881. Mr. *Vane.*] Are those the receipts you produced?—They have my name and address upon them; the whole of them.

14882. Those are the receipts you produced?—Yes.

14883. From whom did you receive the receipts?—That is impossible for me to say.

14884. Can you tell us from whom you received any one of them?—No, I cannot.

14885. For whom did you sign this deed?—For myself.

14886. Who paid the money for those receipts into the bankers?—That I cannot tell.

14887. Did you pay it?—I might or might not,

14888. Did you pay any part of it?—I am not positive.

14889. Can you recollect?—I am not positive.

Upon reference to the bankers' book, it appeared payments were made, corresponding in date with the first receipt of 26th March, for 100 *l.*, from persons of the names of Haye, Dimsdale, Young, Curling, Parker.

14890. Mr. *Vane.*] You have heard those names read: did you receive any one of those receipts from any person whose names you have just heard?—I cannot answer the question.

14891. Do you know any one of those persons?—I do.

14892. Name them?—I know one or two.

14893. Do you know James Haye?—No.

14894. Mr. Dimsdale?—No.

14895. James Young?—No.

14896. Daniel Curling?—No.

14897. Mr. Parker?—I do.

14898. Then Mr. Parker is the only one you know?—Yes.

14899. Do you think you received any one of those receipts from Mr. Parker?—I cannot say.

14900. The next receipt appeared to be dated the 29th of March for 20 *l.*, on which day the bankers' book showed 20 *l.* to have been paid in by R. Wood. Do you know Mr. Wood?—Yes; I know a Mr. Wood.

14901. R. Wood?—I cannot say what his name is.

14902. Did you receive 20 *l.* from Wood on that day?—I did not.

14903. The next receipt was dated the 26th of March for 20 *l.*, and 20 *l.* appeared to have been paid in to the bankers on that day by W. W. White?—I do not know him.

14904. Another sum of 20 *l.* appeared to have been paid in by J. C. Howey?—I do not know him.

14905. Another sum of 20 *l.* by Mr. S. Pitt?—I have heard of such a person, but I do not know him.

14906. The next receipt was dated the 30th of March, for 20 *l.*; and 20 *l.* appeared to have been received on that day by the bankers from R. Hallpike. Do you know that person?—I do not.

14906*. Another sum of 20 *l.* appeared to have been paid in by a Mr. Chappe. Do you know him?—I do not.

14907. Another sum of 20 *l.* paid in by J. W. Peach?—I do not know him.

14908. The next receipt was dated the 29th of March for 90 *l.*, and on that day 90 *l.* appeared to have been paid by John Markhall. Do you know that person?—No; I do not.

14909. The next receipt appeared to be dated the 30th March 1836 for 60 *l.*; and by the bankers' book they appeared to have received no sum that day of that amount; but on the 31st the sum of 60 *l.* appeared to have been received from H. Allen. Do you know him?—I do not.

14910. And on the same day another sum of 60 *l.* appeared to be paid in by Burrison.

14911. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you ever paid any money into the bank of Messrs. Esdaile and Co. on account of the South Midland Railway?—I have not.

Mr. *J. Jackson.*

8 May 1837.

14912. Can you recollect any person from whom you have received any one of those receipts?—Not at this present time; it is impossible.

14913. For whom did you sign that deed?—I signed it in the way of business.

13914. *Chairman.*] What do you mean?—I bought the receipts, and undertook to deliver the shares.

14915. Mr. *Vane.*] To whom?—That is impossible to say.

14916. What commission did you receive on signing for those shares?—None whatever.

14917. Then explain what you mean by undertaking to deliver?—I bought the bankers' receipts, and sold the shares as a jobber, undertaking to deliver them within a certain period.

14918. How came you to incur the responsibility of signing this deed for 310 shares when you had sold the scrip?—I never considered there was any responsibility attached to it; none whatever.

14919. Are you not a jobber in shares?—Yes, I am.

14920. Penny shares?—Anything to get a livelihood.

14921. I believe you have sometimes given your address No. 14, Dorset-place?—I never did it but once, and it was signed Dorset-place by mistake, and I think that was shown; it was for ten shares.

14922. Did you not receive 10*s.* for signing in the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway?—I did.

14923. Do you owe a Mr. Jones the sum of 30 *l.*, the balance of an account?—I do not know who you mean by Mr. Jones.

14924. Mr. Gentleman Jones, as he is sometimes called?—I do not know such a person.

14925. Can you account for the responsibility you incurred in signing for 310 shares after you had sold them?—I sold them, undertaking to sign for them.

14926. *Chairman.*] Did you get a better price for them in consequence of your undertaking the responsibility of signing for them?—That is very likely, but I cannot say at the present moment.

14927. What did you sell them for, can you recollect?—No.

14928. *Vane.*] Did you not say you got a better price by signing the deed for them, than if you did not?—I rather think it is so, but I cannot say positively.

14929. Is it not the custom with jobbers to receive something extra when they sign the deed?—It is not customary.

14930. Has it been done?—Yes.

14931. Have you ever done it yourself?—Yes, I did it for 10*s.*; I have just admitted it.

14932. There will be a call of 10s. per share on these 310 shares on the 1st of June next; shall you be able to pay that call?—They are not in my possession.

14933. Shall you be able to pay that call?—They have no right to call upon me.

14934. *Chairman.*] If you were required to pay an instalment of 10*s.* in consequence of your signing the deed, should you be able to pay that instalment upon the 310 shares; that will be 155 *l.*?—I should not.

14935. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you also signed the City of London Railway for 5,000 *l.*?—I have signed various deeds.

14936. Amounting altogether to 44,600 *l.*?—Very likely I have; I cannot say I have not.

14937. Shall I enumerate them to you?—I should not be able to recollect them, not considering there was any liability.

14938. *Chairman*] You did not keep an account?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Douglas.*

14939. You signed this deed at the Spring of last year?—Yes, it was.

14940. When you applied to sign the deeds, you produced these receipts?—Yes; I produced these receipts, decidedly.

14941. You claimed a right to sign the deed in respect to these receipts?—Of course I did.

14942. Did anything pass then to lead the gentlemen who saw you sign the deed to suppose they were not your shares?—No, not the least.

14943. There is no name appears on the face of these receipts?—I am not aware that there is. [*The receipts were handed to the Witness.*] There is not.

14944. I think

14944. I think you stated you had purchased the whole of these receipts in the market?—I did.

14945. Should you not have thought it very hard, and quite contrary to the usual course of business, if they had not allowed you to sign for these shares?—I did not conceive there would be the least objection made.

14946. You could not have got the scrip unless you had the receipts?—Of course not.

14947. I understand you had entered into an agreement to deliver so much scrip of this company before a certain day?—Within a certain period

14948. You purchased these receipts in the market, and took them down to the office, and claimed to execute in respect of them?—Yes.

14949. And upon executing this deed you had the shares?—Yes.

14950. *Chairman.*] Is this what you call a time bargain?—I do not know whether it was considered a time bargain or not.

14951. Mr. *Douglas.*] Have you dealt very largely in these shares?—Yes; not only this company, but all companies.

14952. Has any objection been made by any company to your signing the deed when you produced the bankers' receipt?—I have never known it.

14953. *Chairman.*] Do you mean to say that there is no company in which they have not allowed a person to sign the deed who held shares that had been transferred?—I do not know what you mean by that; when you hold a receipt you are entitled to sign.

14954. Do you not know that there are some companies in which none but the parties to whom, after application for shares, shares have been allotted, are allowed to sign the deed?—Yes, I do.

14955. Mr. *Douglas.*] There may be some companies where that is the case; but what has been the case in most of the railways?—I never found any difficulty; I was never refused myself.

14956. Have you ever been refused in any one?—Yes, in one; I forget the name of it.

14957. Only in one?—Only in one.

14958. How many deeds may you have signed?—Eight or ten.

14959. And only in one you have been refused, as not being the person to whom the shares were allotted?—That is the case.

14960. Would it be possible for you to have traced these receipts to whom they were originally allotted?—Impossible.

14961. If you had not been allowed to sign, they would have been lost to you?—No, they would have been returned to the parties at the time.

14962. Could you tell the parties?—Yes, at the time I could.

14963. In the way of business it is very possible these receipts may have gone through a considerable number of hands?—Yes, a dozen; they might have gone through a dozen; I do not know that they did.

14964. *Chairman.*] Had you paid for them at the time you applied for leave to sign the deed, carrying these receipts with you?—The money had been paid into the bankers'.

14965. You did not pay the money?—No.

14966. Had you paid the money to the parties who handed these receipts to you?—Not a doubt of it; it was paid.

14967. That you have paid it?—That I have paid it myself.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

14968. You say that on producing the receipts you claimed a right to sign the deed?—There was no objection made.

14969. Was any question asked of you on producing the receipts?—I do not think there was.

14970. But the general custom is, for a person to apply for shares, and if allotted, for him to sign?—No; there was only one in which I was refused.

14971. Mr. *Douglas.*] Was that a railway company?—I do not know.

14972. Mr. *Vane.*] You are positive you paid the money for these receipts before you signed?—I have no doubt of it, but I cannot be positive.

14973. But you think you got a better price by stipulating to sign the deed at the time you signed it?—I think I did.

Mr. *J. Jackson.*

8 May 1837.

14974. *Chairman.*] Did you stipulate at all about signing the deed?—No, I undertook to deliver the shares.

14975. Have you not stated you undertook also to sign as well as deliver?—I undertook to deliver the shares, and whether I signed for them or had to give a better price for them that had been signed, was one and the same thing to me.

14976. You were either to deliver shares that had been signed for by others, or sign for them yourself?—I undertook to deliver shares that had been signed for.

14977. And you believe the price of the shares was a little better in consequence of their having been signed for than if they had not been?—I think they were.

Mr. *Vane* proposed to deliver in a certificate of the baptism of John Layland.

14978. *Chairman* (to Mr. *Vane*).] Did you apply to any person for a document relating to the age of John Layland?—Yes, I did; I applied to Mr. Lawrence.

14979. Who is he?—A large merchant at Liverpool.

14980. Did you apply by letter?—Personally.

14981. Where was he?—I met him in the lobby of the House of Commons.

14982. What did he say?—He told me that John Layland was a clerk of his, and under age.

14983. Did you read at the time to Mr. Lawrence, the description of John Layland, as it stands in the printed subscription list?—I did; he said, "That is my clerk."

14984. Did he furnish you with any documents?—Yes, he did.

14985. What are they?—The first is a paper purporting to be a certificate of the baptism of John Layland, and the other an admission, signed by John Layland, and witnessed by another clerk of Mr. Lawrence's, that John Layland signed the deed though he was only eighteen years of age at the time he signed it.

14986. Read it?—"I, the undersigned, John Layland, of Liverpool, in the county of Lancaster, book-keeper, do hereby admit and acknowledge, that in or about the month of March 1836, I signed the Parliamentary contract and the subscription list of the South Midland Counties Railway Company; that at the time I so signed I was only eighteen years of age, or thereabouts; that in signing I followed the example of many others, and that I was quite unaware of the responsibility I was incurring, and ignorant of the error or fraud I was committing, and that I was baptized in the chapelry of Hale, in the county of Lancaster, on the 1st February 1818. Witness my hand, 9th day of April 1837, John Layland. Witness, William Courter."

Then the certificate of the Minister. (Page 35.)

"Baptisms solemnized in the chapelry of Hale, in the county of Lancaster, in the year 1818.

"February 1.—John, son of Henry and Elizabeth Layland, Hale, schoolmaster. Ceremony performed by William Stewart, Perp. Curate."

"The above is a true copy of the register kept at Hale Chapel, in the parish of Childwall, and county of Lancaster, extracted by me, William Stewart, Minister, Hale, 27 March 1837.

14987. How long after the conversation you had with Mr. Lawrence did he supply to you those documents?—In about three or four days.

14988. Are you personally acquainted with Mr. Lawrence?—I was introduced to him that day.

14989. Is he in town?—No, he is not. I was introduced to him; I have seen him sitting several times at the Board of Directors.

14990. Where?—Of the London and Birmingham Railway.

Mr. *Bere* contended that the person named in the certificate ought to be identified, and that it would have been more satisfactory to have had the person before the Committee.

Mr. *Vane* stated he should be happy to produce Mr. Lawrence if the Committee would adjourn for a sufficient length of time to enable him to do so.

The *Chairman* stated that the Committee considered that the evidence was receivable.

A letter of Mr. Coglan, the agent at Liverpool for the South Midland Company, was shown to the Chairman.

The *Chairman* suggested that the better way would be to write to Mr. Coglan

Coglan upon the subject; and that any explanation he gave with reference to this particular case should be received in evidence. Mr. J. Jackson.

Mr. *Vere* stated he was quite satisfied. 8 May 1837.

Mr. *Robert Johnson*, called in; and Examined. Mr. R. Johnson.

14991. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside, or where is your place of business?—The Stock Exchange is my place of business.

14992. What are you?—A stockbroker.

14993. *Chairman.*] Are you a member of the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

14994. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know George William Morrison, 56, Basinghall-street, city?—I know a George William Morrison; I do not recollect the number; I know he resided there.

14995. Where does he reside now?—He is gone to the West Indies.

14996. When did he go?—About six months ago.

14997. He has signed the South Midland Railway Company's deed for 210 shares, amounting to 10,500 *l.*; do you know his handwriting?—Yes, I do.

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

14998. Is that his handwriting?—Yes, it is.

14999. Do you know anything of his responsibility as to money matters?—Yes, I know a little about it.

15000. State what you know of it?—I believe him to be perfectly unable to meet a demand of that kind. I do not think he has got any property.

15001. There will be a call of ten shillings a share upon these shares in the month of June; is he able to pay it?—Not of his own means certainly.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Douglas.*

15002. Do you know Mr. Morrison's writing?—Yes.

15003. Just see if these letters are his handwriting (*Handing some papers to the Witness*). Yes, they are.

The letters appeared to be letters of application for shares; the first dated 2d April 1836, for 30 shares; another the 23d March, for 40 shares; and another dated April 4th, renewing the application; and the letters appeared to be dated, one from the Stock Exchange, and the others, 56, Basinghall-street.

15004. *Chairman.*] Does he make any references in the letters?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes, he first refers to Henry Kingscote, esq., our banker, and in another he refers to Mr. Eck on the Stock Exchange.

15005. *Chairman.*] In consequence of these letters were any shares allotted to him?—Mr. *Douglas.*] None appear to have been allotted to him, but afterwards when the advertisement appeared, that the deed was ready for signature from the 25th of April to the 1st of May, he attended at the office and produced these receipts.

[*The bankers' receipts were handed to the Witness.*]

15006. Mr. *Douglas.*] Is that the handwriting of Mr. Morrison on the back of these receipts?—Yes, they are all his signatures.

15007. You state that the endorsement, George W. Morrison, are in his (Morrison's) handwriting?—Yes, they are.

Mr. *Douglas* stated that the bankers' receipts to the amount of 210 *l.* were produced at the time Mr. Morrison signed the deed, and that the entries in the bankers' book corresponded with the receipts.

15008. Mr. *Douglas.*] How long have you been acquainted with Mr. Morrison?—From infancy.

15009. He is a stockbroker?—He was never a member of the Stock Exchange.

15010. He dealt in shares?—Yes.

15011. I believe Mr. Morrison is not in a good state of health?—In a very bad state of health.

15012. Do you know whether his going abroad arises from his state of health?—Yes, it does.

15013. Are you well acquainted with Morrison's affairs, what expectations he may have?—Yes, I have known him from infancy; I know most of his affairs.

15014. Are his relations and connexions respectable people, and people of property?—They are not.

Mr. *R. Johnson.*

8 May 1837.

15015. Do you know Mr. Eck of the Stock Exchange, he gives a reference to him?—Yes, I know him.

15016. Is he a respectable man?—Yes.

15017. When you state that Morrison has no property, do you know that of your own knowledge?—Yes.

15018. In what situation has he gone to the West Indies?—He is gone out for his health, but he has friends there, in the West Indies, and he is gone to them; he was recommended to go there.

15019. He is gone there with his own means?—I cannot say positively that it is so; I believe he was assisted, even in going out.

15020. Do you think he has friends who will assist him in finding money for these shares if he was called upon?—Not unless there was a prospect of the return of the same sum.

15021. Would you?—Yes; I would advance it where I was confident of getting it back with interest, or something of that kind.

15022. Suppose this company was looked at favourably, would you lend him the money?—Not unless there was security given to me for the amount.

15023. You would not do it on his own responsibility?—No.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

15024. These shares are very low?—Yes, they are, but I know very little of them; I believe there is no market for many of them.

15025. Mr. *Douglas.*] There is no market for any of these railways?—Almost none.

15026. Mr. *Vane.*] You would not advance the money if the shares were at a discount?—No; certainly not.

15027. Mr. *Forster.*] Is it the common practice of stockbrokers to subscribe in their own names to a railway company on behalf of other persons, the subscriber having no interest whatever in the shares?—I should think not; I should think no stockbroker would sign his name to any deed for any friend.

15028. No respectable broker?—No; I have had shares that I have given money to others to sign for me, that the responsibility might go off my own shoulders.

15029. *Chairman.*] You have requested other parties to sign railway deeds for you that you might incur no responsibility in signing?—Yes.

15030. Have you ever paid parties money for so doing?—Yes, I have.

15031. Do you believe that to be a common practice?—I do not know that it is common, but it is done.

15032. Can you state any railway company's deed in which you have done that?—The precise one I do not recollect; but I have done it.

15033. Have you done it in the South Midland Company?—No, I have not.

15034. Mr. *Vane.*] Can you tell us the price of the shares at this moment?—No, I cannot.

Mr. *George Saunders,* called in; and Examined.

Mr. *G. Saunders.*

15035. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside now?—At Camberwell, Southampton-street.

15036. What are you?—An attorney's clerk.

15037. *Chairman.*] Who is the attorney to whom you are clerk?—Mr. Tomkins, Essex-court, Temple.

15038. Mr. *Vane.*] Was that the gentleman you were talking to just now?—Yes.

15039. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Railway?—Yes, I did.

15040. How many shares did you apply for?—I do not recollect. [*The deed was shown to the Witness.*] That is my name and writing.

15041. Where did you sign that deed?—At a first floor by Charing-cross.

15042. Did you produce the bankers' receipts for 130 *l.*, when you signed this?—Yes, I did.

15043. From whom did you receive the receipts?—I believe they were all my own shares; but I am not quite sure of it.

15044. *Chairman.*] That is not an answer?—I am unable to state whether they all are.

15045. Mr. *Vane.*] From whom did you receive the bankers' receipt for 130 *l.*?—They are divided; you must let me answer it in my own way; about thirty or forty; I do not say whether it is thirty or fifty; however strange it may appear, I am unable to say that.

[*A letter was shown to the Witness*]

15046. Is that your writing?—Yes.

15047. How many shares is it for?—Only five.

15048. Did you make any other application?—I believe not.

15049. *Chairman.*] Were any shares allotted to you?—I believe not.

15050. Did you receive any letter from the company, informing you that shares were allotted to you?—I think not.

15051. Mr. *Vane.*] From whom did you receive the bankers' receipts for 130 *l.*?—I am utterly unable to say; I received them from different parties.

15052. *Chairman.*] You received different receipts from different parties?—Yes.

15053. State any one of those parties?—I purchased a large portion of them in the market.

15054. How many did you purchase in the market?—I think about seventy.

15055. Mr. *Vane.*] Then there is the remaining sixty?—It must be something more I bought.

15056. *Chairman.*] There was some balance remaining you did not purchase?—Yes.

15057. What was the case with regard to those?—I signed for a friend, for a bottle of wine.

15058. Who was that?—A gentleman of the name of Dyne.

15059. Where does he live?—In Lincoln's Inn Fields.

15060. What is he?—A solicitor.

15061. About how many was it?—I think it was thirty.

15062. Mr. *Vane.*] Tell me whether those are the receipts which you produced [*handing some papers to the Witness*]?—I cannot.

15063. Are they endorsed by you?—Yes, these are my signatures.

15064. Look at them, and tell the Committee from whom you received them?—I cannot tell where I got them; whether those are the identical ones I paid originally, I cannot tell.

15065. *Chairman.*] Do you see there the one that Mr. Dyne gave you?—Here is one for thirty, I should think that was the one.

15066. What name appears upon it?—My name is endorsed upon it.

15067. What is the date?—The 26th of March.

15068. Is there any other for thirty?—Here is another.

15069. What is the date of the second?—The 29th of March.

Upon reference to the bankers' book, the following receipts appeared:
26th March, of George Wilson, 30 *l.*

15070. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know him?—No.

Mr. Francis Hall appeared to have paid in 30 *l.*

15071. Do you know him?—No.

15072. E. Brennan; do you know him?—I do not know him.

15073. Mr. G. Griffith; do you know him?—I paid fifty South Midland myself on the last day, I think.

15074. Mr. *Douglas.*] George Boncey paid 30 *l.* that day; do you know him?—No.

15075. Mr. *Douglas.*] On the 29th, Richard Lawson paid in 30 *l.*?—

Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know him?—

Witness.] No.

15076. Mr. *Douglas.*] J. H. Robson?—

Mr. *Vane.*] Do you know him?—

Witness.] Yes; I know him, but had nothing to do with him.

15077. E. Clarrick; do you know him?—No.

15078. R. Wilson?—I do not know him; I know a gentleman of the name of Wilson.

15079. Had you any dealings with him in respect of these shares?—Not any at all.

15080. Will you try and recollect yourself, and inform us from whom you received any one of those receipts?—I should give an explanation why I cannot tell;

Mr. G. Saunders.

8 May 1837.

tell; but the fact is, I have had in my hands a large number of these shares, and I have lent them. It was not an uncommon thing for a man to want change, as it is called; and I have lent them, and given change in that manner, and I suppose that these shares are just as likely to be another party's as the man I spoke of.

15081. Are they not signed by your name?—Yes; they are the shares I gave up when I signed the deed; there is no doubt of the identity of them.

15082. Is it usual for clerks to solicitors to be dealing so largely in shares?—No; many do it.

15083. How do you carry on the business?—Generally through a broker.

15084. Did you in this instance employ a broker?—No, I did not.

15085. Did you receive any one of those receipts from Mr. Tomkins?—No, not one.

15086. Did you receive any one of those receipts from Mr. Burnand, a stock-jobber?—It is not unlikely that I did.

15087. Can you tell me what number of shares, or what sum?—I will give you the only answer I can. I had 20 from a gentleman of the name of Burnand, for the South Western, or South Midland.

15088. You received part of them, you think, from him?—It is very likely I did; 20 or 30 South Westerns or South Midlands; and this may be one.

15089. Did he give you anything for signing the deed?—He either gave me a bottle of wine or 5 *s.*, I do not recollect which.

15090. He either gave you 5 *s.*, or a bottle of wine, for signing a deed?—Yes.

15091. *Chairman.*] What deed was it?—I cannot tell; it was either the South Western Railway or the South Midland, I am not sure which.

15092. Who is Mr. Burnand?—He is a gentleman that speculates occasionally in shares.

15093. Where does he live?—I do not know.

15094. Mr. *Vane.*] Try and recollect whether it was not the South Midland deed?—I think it is, because I am unable to make up the number for which I find I signed the deed otherwise; but that is the only reason I have to believe so.

15095. Have you ever received any money for signing any other deeds?—I believe I have received about a guinea in my whole life for such a purpose.

15096. Did Mr. Tomkins ever pay you any part of it?—Never.

15097. Was he aware you were jobbing in shares?—I did not job.

15098. Is he aware you have signed these deeds?—He is aware I have often signed deeds *bonâ fide*, where I held the shares; he is aware I invested my money in joint stock companies, and he knows I must sign the deeds of course.

15099. I see you signed the South Western deed as of Penton-place, Pentonville; did you reside there?—Yes, for nearly 20 years.

15100. Did you reside there at the time you signed?—Yes; I have no doubt of it; but I have shares in several companies, and the letters almost always went there; and for a month after I left there I was in the habit of calling there from long habit, and it was more convenient.

15101. When did you leave?—About two years ago.

15102. When did you leave Westbrook cottages?—At Christmas last I left there; I lived there a year.

15103. You must have signed the South Western deed at the time you resided there?—Yes, I suppose I did; but I have given my reason for addressing there; I had been in the habit of addressing there for 20 years.

15104. Was it by mistake?—No; because it was more convenient to have them go there than elsewhere; I was better known there; people could not find me; they went to Kensington.

15105. You have signed the South Western deed for 5,000 *l.*?—I do not know the amount of capital; I signed for a large number of shares.

15106. Have you signed Gibbs's Brighton line?—That was for fifty shares.

15107. Have you also signed Rennie's Brighton line?—That was ten shares.

15108. £. 750, as appears by the printed list?—It was the second deed I signed.

15109. Are you aware that you have signed deeds to the amount of 13,250 *l.*?—I am aware it is a large amount; I do not know the precise amount.

15110. There will be a call of 10 *s.* a share upon those 130 shares in the South Midland on the 1st June next, shall you be enabled to pay that call?—I really do not know.

15111. Are you able to do it now?—I could if I liked.

15112. Of

15112. Of your own resources?—Yes.

15113. Could you pay 6,500 *l.* by instalments as it would become due?—No, I think not; I do not think it at all likely.

15114. *Chairman*] What salary are you in the receipt of?—£. 120 a year.

15115. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you any other private funds besides that?—I have property.

15116. What is it worth by the year?—I cannot tell, for it is a good deal in joint stock companies that pay no dividends.

15117. Is this 13,500 *l.* a part of your property?—That is no property at all, that is only a liability.

15118. As you are a clerk to a solicitor, you must be aware you were incurring great responsibility when you signed the deed?—Yes, I was.

15119. Do you know Hugh Evans Fisher?—Yes.

15120. Where is he at present?—I believe he is at present in Bath, or elsewhere, in the West of England.

15121. *Chairman.*] What is he?—He was an attorney, he is no longer on the rolls.

15122. Mr. *Vane.*] How long is it since he was on the rolls?—About seven years.

15123. Was he clerk to Mr. Tomkins?—He was formerly, but has not been for some years.

15124. I see he has signed this deed, describing himself as of 3, Essex-court, Solicitor, 20 shares?—£. 1,000 Yes.

15125. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes.

15126. *Chairman.*] Do you know anything of his circumstances?—I believe he is worth 700 *l.* or 800 *l.*; I should guess.

15127. Mr. *Vane.*] You would guess?—Yes; I cannot answer otherwise than vaguely.

15128. From what do you form that opinion?—Two relations have died lately, and have left him some money; and with respect to one, I have lodged a distringas at the bank; I believe his claim to be a good one, and I believe him to be worth something under 1,000 *l.*

15129. Is the distringas you have lodged a distringas on the part of creditors?—No, it is not.

15130. Do you know whether he is involved at all?—He owes some trifling debts, and the property is small, but he is not involved.

15131. How came he to describe himself as of Essex-court, Temple?—I cannot tell that; he was in the habit of having lodgings, which he left very frequently, and letters came there for him; he considered it more convenient.

15132. He has signed the South Western; did you see him sign it?—No.

15133. Are you aware he signed it for 750 *l.*?—Yes, I know the fact.

15134. And for 3,000 *l.*?—Yes, he may have done so.

15135. Do you think he is capable of paying the next instalment of these shares, 10 *l.*?—Yes, twenty times the amount.

15136. Is he able to pay 1,000 *l.* as the calls will be made upon it?—I do not think he would; I know many that could, but will not.

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

15137. Do you believe that to be his writing?—Yes, I have no doubt of it.

15138. The whole of it?—Yes.

15139. Did the whole of those twenty shares belong to him?—I do not know.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Douglas.*

15140. I understand you applied for shares in this company, but they were not given to you?—I believe that was the case.

15141. Did you subsequently buy a good many in the market?—Yes; I bought some at five-eighths in the market, which I am very sorry for; I got in at the top.

15142. Were you in the habit, at that time, of buying shares in many other companies?—Not in many others; I have been in the habit of buying fifty or one hundred shares when I thought it prudent so to do.

15143. In April last you saw an advertisement of the deed being ready for signature?—I heard of it from various persons.

15144. And you attended at the office and signed the deed?—Yes.

15145. And you produced those receipts?—Yes, I did.

15146. At the time that you produced those receipts, did anything pass to lead

Mr. *G. Saunders.*

8 May 1837.

the secretary, who saw you sign the deed, to suppose they were not your own?—No.

15147. He had every reason to believe they were yours?—Yes.

15148. Did you state to him that they were?—I do not think that anything passed, but the presumption was that they were mine, and I treated them as such.

15149. You would have thought it very harsh if you had given five-eighths premium for those shares that were your own, and not to have been allowed to sign?—No doubt I should.

15150. How many of these shares do you state were your own, or how many you purchased?—My recollection is, that I held something under 100, but I am unable to say what number I did hold.

15151. And those shares you have purchased at a premium?—A portion of them.

15152. Would it have been possible for you to have traced those shares to the person to whom they were originally allotted?—Not that I am aware of.

15153. If the company had not allowed you to have executed the deeds and granted the scrip, this money would have been lost to you?—Yes, if they had permanently refused.

15154. From your practice in dealing in these shares, are you aware of any case where parties have been possessed of receipts and they have been refused?—Yes; I have been refused myself, but they afterwards allowed me to do it.

15155. *Chairman.*] In what case were you refused?—In Gibbs's Brighton Line; and I have heard of others, but I do not know the fact of my own knowledge; I believe they suffered them all, within the lapse of a month, to sign.

15156. Can you state positively that you were paid any thing, a bottle of wine or any thing else, for signing the deed of the South Midland?—I think I was; but I am really not quite sure.

15157. Did you sign for Mr. Dyne, of Lincoln's-inn?—Yes, I have no doubt of it; when the subject was mentioned to me it brought it to my recollection; and when I was asked if I had not been prompted (if I may use that expression) I should not have recollected it.

15158. Mr. *Douglas.*] But you are quite sure that nothing passed at the office to lead them to suppose they were the property of any one else?—No; I conducted myself in such a way, as far as I could, as to lead them to believe they were my own property.

The London Gazette of the 28th February 1837, was produced, by which it appeared that Joseph Zenetti was declared a bankrupt.

Mr. *William Evans Hutchinson*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *W. Hutchinson.*

15159. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—At Leicester.

15160. What are you?—I am a chemist and druggist.

15161. Did you inquire at the residence of Mr. Joseph Zenetti, of Exchange-street, Manchester, printseller?—I visited his residence, and asked to see him.

15162. What were you told there?—I was told that I could not see him.

15163. For what reason?—I was not told the reason by any person at his residence, but was informed by a neighbour that he was a bankrupt.

15164. *Chairman.*] Who was that neighbour?—His name was Dawson.

15165. Does he live in the immediate neighbourhood?—Within three or four hundred yards.

15166. He is a printseller there?—Yes; and a carver and gilder.

15167. Mr. *Vane.*] Look at that advertisement, and tell me whether you believe that is the same person? [*handing the London Gazette to the Witness*]—Yes, I believe this to be the same person.

15168. *Chairman.*] Did you obtain any information as to his having signed the South Midland deed?—That was the information I wished to obtain from him.

15169. Did you obtain that information from any other person?—I was informed by Joseph Stones he had signed the deed.

15170. Who is Joseph Stones?—A bookbinder in Manchester.

15171. That Mr. Zenetti had signed the deed?—Yes.

15172. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you inquire at Liverpool for John Clark, plumber and glazier?—Yes.

15173. What were you informed there?—That he was a bankrupt, and had gone off to America.

15174. Who told you that?—Mr. Stock, a glass-merchant.

15175. Have

15175. Have the goodness to look at that advertisement, and say whether you think that is the same person [*handing the London Gazette of 21st February 1837 to the Witness*]; do you believe that to be the same person?—Yes, I do.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Douglas.*

15176. You reside at Leicester?—Yes, I do.

15177. Are you a member on the Canal Committee?—Yes, I am.

15178. The Northamptonshire Union Canal Committee?—I am.

Mr. *Vane* objected to the question as irrelevant.

The *Chairman* stated, that anything relating to the competency of the witness or his character was relevant.

15179. Mr. *Douglas.*] There was a sub-committee appointed to carry on the opposition to the South Midland Railway?—I think there was.

15180. Did you form one of that committee?—I did.

15181. Funds were voted for that purpose?—We were empowered generally to conduct the opposition to the South Midland.

15182. And funds voted?—No specific sum.

15183. You were authorized to apply such sum as you thought proper?—We were authorized in general terms to oppose the South Midland Railway.

15184. What was the object of your journey to Manchester and Liverpool?—I wished to see the subscribers to the deed of the South Midland Railway.

15185. For what purpose?—For the purpose of having conversation with them respecting the shares of that company, and to show them that their interest was identified with ours in not going on with it.

15186. In fact, to induce them to sign a petition against it?—Of course.

15187. You took a petition down with you?—I took a petition; to which I requested them to attach their signatures, if they thought proper.

15188. You have spoken of a person of the name of Clark being a bankrupt; at what time did he become bankrupt?—I cannot speak as to the precise time; the Gazette is February 21st 1837.

15189. *Chairman.*] Does Mr. James Clark appear as a bankrupt in that Gazette?—Yes, he does.

15190. Mr. *Douglas.*] I believe you went down to Leeds also?—Yes, I did.

15191. And Wakefield?—Yes.

15192. Did you call a meeting of the shareholders at Wakefield?—I did not.

Mr. *Vane* objected to the question.

Mr. *Douglas* was heard in support of the question. It was admitted that the witness had been round to Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, and Wakefield among the shareholders, to obtain signatures to a petition against the South Midland Company's bill being further proceeded with.

15193. Mr. *Douglas.*] There was a meeting of the shareholders at Wakefield; you called a meeting?—I did not.

15194. At Bradford did you?—I did not call the meeting; the meeting was called, which I attended.

15195. Will you state what passed at that meeting?

Mr. *Vane* objected to the question.

The *Chairman* stated that the witness might be asked what course he pursued at the meeting.

15196. *Chairman.*] What did you do yourself?—I explained to them a variety of matters relating to the subscription deed of the company.

15197. Circumstances not favourable to the progress of the bill?—Certainly.

15198. Mr. *Douglas.*] In consequence of your representation, did the shareholders sign any petition against us?—They did not.

15199. Did they come to this resolution, that however anxious they might be to be released from the company, they thought Mr. Hutchinson's way of obtaining it was a very improper one?—They did not.

15200. Did not they come to a resolution to that effect?—They did not while I was present; they did not come to any such resolution; none such was communicated to me.

15201. Will you state to this Committee what you stated to the shareholders there, in order to induce them to sign the petition?—I stated the difficulty of the country, the very small local interest that parties on the line held in the company, and

Mr. *W. Hutchinson.*

8 May 1837.

and the great amount held in London, and that I considered they were not held by responsible parties; men of property; and there might be other matters.

15202. Did you state anything of their liability till the Act of the company was obtained?—I read to them extracts from the document deposited in the Private Bill Office, which stated, they were liable for the whole amount in various ways.

15203. Did you not represent to them, that what they had been informed, that they were only liable to a further call of 1 *l.* till the Act was obtained, was erroneous?—I gave it as my opinion, and stated there was no saving clause in the deed deposited in the Private Bill Office.

15204. Mr. *Bere.*] Did you know either Mr. Clark or Mr. Zenetti before the time you saw them in the *Gazette*?—No.

15205. You did not know the station they held in society before they became bankrupts?—No, not at all.

The *Chairman* stated, there was no reflection upon the company in consequence of allowing their signatures to the deed.

15206. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you know the circumstances of the parties now?—No, I do not.

15207. You are the gentleman who has been sitting here, and taking an active part in these proceedings?—Yes.

15208. Are you taking a part here on behalf of the Northamptonshire Canal?—I am not specially deputed to do it; I am watching these proceedings before the Committee.

15209. On whose behalf?—If I am in any public capacity, I am here as a member of a committee appointed by the landowners to manage this case.

15210. You mean to represent to this Committee you do not appear here on behalf of the canal company?—Not specially.

15211. Have they instructed you to come here generally?—As I expressed before, I am a member of the sub-committee of the canal company, but I appear here in conjunction with the landowners.

15212. And were expressly appointed to oppose this line?—Yes; the landowners were.

15213. And the sub-committee were?—Yes, the sub-committee were as well. I have always been known as an enemy to this concern, and the solicitor knows it well. I appear here, deputed at a meeting of landowners at Market Harborough.

15214. I take for granted you are a Quaker?—I am so called.

15215. I know you make great professions as regards truth; I ask you, having regard to your profession of truth, whether you do not appear here, and have not appeared here, in consequence of the sub-committee of the canal company authorizing the opposition to this company?—I am here specially, because I was nominated at a meeting of landed proprietors, held in Market Harborough, to oppose this railway.

15216. Having a regard to truth, do you not appear here on behalf of the canal company?—If I had not been a member of the canal committee I should not have been at the meeting, and should not have been here.

15217. Do you appear here on behalf of the canal company?—[*No answer.*]

15218. *Chairman.*] Do you consider you appear here on behalf of the canal company or not?—I am mixed up with the opposition.

15219. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you or not appear here on behalf of the canal company?—Not alone.

15220. Do you appear for them at all?—As far as they are interested in opposing the South Midland Railway.

15221. Are they not deeply interested in it?—Yes.

15222. Then you do appear here for them?—Yes, in part.

25223. Do you not expect partly to be paid by them?—Partly to be paid by them.

15224. Is not the solicitor of the company present too?—No, he is not.

15225. I mean the gentleman sitting on Mr. Vane's right hand, I mean Mr. Robinson; is not he a director of that canal company, or the chairman?—Yes, he is.

15226. Is Mr. Robinson a landowner on the line?—Not that I am aware of.

15227. His only interest is as a member of the canal company?—I presume so.

15228. Are

15228. Are there other parties contributing to the expense besides the canal company?—Undoubtedly. Mr. *W. Hutchinson.*

8 May 1837.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

15229. Be kind enough to look at that, and tell me whether you were present at that meeting? [*handing a paper to the Witness*]—Yes, I was. This is a document by which I am appointed by the landowners.

15230. Do you know of your own knowledge whether Mr. Fisher is an agent of the landowners, or appears here as such?—Yes, I do; I was also appointed to appear on behalf of the landowners with Mr. Fisher and Mr. Robinson.

The London Gazette, dated 11th of November 1836, was produced, by which it appeared that James Stringer, of the borough of Northampton, scrivener, dealer and chapman, was declared a bankrupt.

Mr. *Thomas Green*, again called in; and further Examined.

The answers of the witness upon his former examination to the following questions were read: 9355, 9356, 9357, 9358, 9360, 9362 and 9363. Mr. *Thomas Green.*

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

15231. You say he has been unable to pay his deficiencies?—Yes, I do.

15232. When did he become unable?—Which occasion are you speaking of, they are so common: if you will speak to the time, I will tell you.

15233. When did his disability to answer his claims first arise?—I should say, within the last twelve months, four or five different times; the particular time, it is impossible to say.

15234. Can you say that he was insolvent twelve months ago?—Decidedly so, so far as his own transactions were concerned.

15235. Will you tell me the first time you knew him as a defaulter on the Royal Exchange?—To speak of dates is impossible; if I had known three years ago that I should have been called upon in this committee-room to have stated the day and hour on which he was a defaulter, I would have made memorandums, but being a defaulter, and I knowing it, I state the same as a fact.

15236. Instead of making a speech, give me an answer to the question. Will you tell me the first time you knew him a defaulter on the Royal Exchange?—It is impossible to state.

15237. You have been at his house?—I have been, I think, once.

15238. When was that?—About ten weeks ago.

15239. Were you ever in the house before or since?—Never.

15240. Were you in the house?—No, in the shop.

15241. Where does he live?—102, Wood-street.

15242. Does he carry on business as a barber?—Yes.

15243. Do you know the extent of his business?—No.

15244. Does he carry on business there now?—I cannot say.

15245. How long have you known him carry on business there?—I have known him carrying it on, by report, ever since I knew him.

15246. How long is that?—Three years.

15247. Does he occupy the whole house?—I do not know.

15248. Does he appear there as the tenant of the house or a lodger?—He does as the tenant.

15249. Has he got the whole house or only a part?—I cannot judge from the appearance.

15250. Did you see any lodgers there?—I cannot answer that question; I saw persons in the shop that might have been lodgers.

15251. Where did you become acquainted with his handwriting?—On the Royal Exchange, and seeing him write letters and having received letters from him.

15252. Have you got any with you?—No, but I could produce two or three.

15253. Have you ever seen him write on 'Change?—No.

15254. Where have you seen him write?—At the public-houses round the Exchange.

15255. You have seen him write?—Yes.

15256. Mr. *Vane.*] Is that the writing of Gustavus Edward Becker? [*showing the deed to the Witness.*]—Yes, it is.

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

8 May 1837.

15257. Is it Becker or Beckering?—Becker.

The answer of the witness to question No. 9366 was read.

15258. What were his circumstances a year ago?—They were very bad.

15259. Was he capable of paying 5 *l.*?—I could not undertake to say whether he was capable of paying 5 *l.* I should say he was not capable of paying 20 *l.*

Also the answers to the questions numbered 9369, 9370, 9371, 9372, 9373, 9374, 9375, and 9376.

15260. Mr. *Bere.*] Where did Becker live?—Hill-street, Walworth.

15261. What business did he carry on?—The business of a jobber in penny shares, and I believe lately also dealt in penny blacking.

15262. Any thing else?—Not that I know of.

15263. You have been in the house?—Yes, only to inquire.

15264. When did you go first to inquire?—Since these proceedings.

15265. Did you know him before?—Yes, I did.

15266. Had you ever been at his house before?—Never.

15267. You say you know his handwriting?—Yes.

15268. How did you become acquainted with it?—By mixing with him, and seeing him write his name a hundred times.

15269. Just look at that [*handing a paper to the Witness*]; is that his signature?—Yes, it is.

The bankers' receipt was produced for 50 *l.*, endorsed by Mr. Becker.

15270. How long have you known him?—Between two and three years.

15271. You say you think he was in better circumstances twelve months ago?—I know he was.

15272. Can you fix any date for that?—I can fix ever since last Christmas twelvemonth; ever since I have known him he has been in distressed circumstances; from the very first day I knew him till the very last day he was in extremely distressed circumstances.

15273. Have you ever had any transactions in business with him?—Yes.

15274. Have you ever received any deposit shares from him?—No.

15275. Or bankers' receipts?—No.

15276. What descriptions of transactions had you with him?—Time bargains.

15277. Explain that?—It is a business on the Royal Exchange, and what Mr. Becker and other parties like myself do, buy a commodity they do not possess to deliver by a certain day, and pay the difference.

15278. In these transactions is it necessary for you to give credit to each other?—Yes.

15279. Have these transactions been to a large amount?—£. 2 or 3 *l.* balance.

15280. That degree of credit you must have given him?—There was no real credit; I may have had that difference to take of him of 2 *l.* or 3 *l.*, or he may have had that to take of me.

15281. Has that occurred frequently?—In the general routine of business.

15282. Has that occurred frequently?—Yes.

15283. Has it continued from the time you have known him till the present time?—Yes.

15284. You speak of his going to gambling-houses.—Yes.

15285. Have you ever been with him?—Yes.

15286. When did you first go with him to a gambling-house?—I should say within eighteen months ago.

15287. Is it within twelve months?—No.

15288. You have not within twelve months been into a gambling-house with him?—No.

15289. How often have you been into a gambling-house with him?—Not more than six times in my life.

15290. How often have you been into a gambling-house with him?—Twice.

15291. Will you venture to say it was more than once?—Yes; it may have been three times.

15292. Do you mean to say you have ever been in a gambling-house with him twice?—Never with him; I have met him there.

15293. Have you met him there twice?—Yes, I think I have.

15294. Have you played with him?—I have played with the company generally.

15295. Have you played when he has been present?—He might have been playing there at the same time and I not know it.

15296. Were

15296. Were you present when any subscriptions were made for him?—I was not only present, but gave towards them.

15297. How much may you have given?—I might have given 5 *s.* or 10 *s.*; I do not make a memorandum of what I give away in charity.

15298. I beg to ask you if you gave a shilling?—I will undertake to say I have given money towards his subscription.

15299. You spoke of a subscription being raised for him to go to Bath?—I am not speaking to one, but that subscriptions have been got up, and I have given to them.

15300. When did you give anything?—I think a subscription was made by a person of the name of Hold, and I think I gave 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

15301. When was that?—About twelve months ago.

15302. What was the state of your money transactions with him?—Not a farthing difference.

15303. Have you had any transactions since with him?—I might have had.

15304. Do you know anything of the subscription about Bath?—I only know it from what Mr. Jackson told me.

15305. *Chairman.*] Has Mr. Jackson asked you to subscribe money?—No, he did not; he spoke of Becker being in a very distressed situation; that he had got a situation near Box, and he wanted money to take him down: my finances would not allow me to give anything.

15306. Mr. *Vane.*] A receipt has been shown to you for 50 *l.*?—I did not look at the face of it.

15307. Is it not the practice when shares have been allotted for a person on 'Change to borrow 50 *l.* upon the allotment of a certain number of shares in any company; for instance, this company?—On the Royal Exchange many men, however poor they may be, receive assistance from parties better off; and if a man takes a letter of appropriation, if 50 *l.* are lent upon it when it is worth 51 *l.*, that will put 1 *l.* into the pocket of the poor man, and they will lend it to him, while he goes to the bankers' to pay the deposit.

15308. Mr. *Douglas.*] Do you know Dandridge's handwriting?—Yes, I do.

15309. Just see if that is his writing? [*handing a paper to the Witness.*]—Yes, it is.

A bankers' receipt, dated 29th March 1836, for 30 *l.* was produced, endorsed by Dandridge.

Mr. *Douglas* stated it had been produced to the secretary at the time of signing.

The following answers of the witness were read to the questions numbered, 9446 and 9447.

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

15310. Is that the handwriting of Algernon Lens Piercy?—Yes; that is his handwriting; I do not say it is his name.

The answers to the following questions were read: 9450, 9451, 9453, 9454, 9455, 9456, 9457, 9458, 9459, 9460, 9463, 9464, 9465, 9466, 9467, 9468, and 9469.

15311. Mr. *Douglas.*] Do you know Piercy's handwriting?—Yes, I do.

15312. Look at that paper? [*handing a letter to the Witness.*]—It appears to be his handwriting.

15313. *Chairman.*] You think it is?—Yes.

15314-15. Mr. *Douglas.*] Is that his handwriting? [*handing another paper to the Witness.*]—Yes, I think it is.

One of the letters that had been shown to the witness was read, dated April the 9th, from No. 7, Capel-court, Bank, purporting to be an application for 30 shares, signed William Algernon Piercy, addressed to —— Baresq., to the care of Mr. Scriven, Northampton.

15316. *Chairman.*] Were shares allotted to him?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes they were.

[*Another paper was handed to the Witness.*]

Witness.] Yes; I think it is his handwriting; there is a flourish that is generally about his signature, which is not here; you will see it yourself in other writings of his; it is not the manner in which he generally signs his name.

15317. *Chairman.*] Were all the shares allotted to him that he applied for?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes, the 30 shares. Is that his handwriting?

[*Handing another paper to the Witness.*]

Mr. *Thomas Green.*

8 May 1837.

Witness.] Yes, that is: you will see the difference there.

The bankers' receipt was produced, endorsed by Piercy, and dated 26 March 1836, for 30 *l.*

15318. Mr. *Vane.*] Is that the handwriting of R. Blakemore? [*handing the deed to the Witness*]—Yes, it is.

The following answers of the witness, to questions numbered as under, were read: 9474, 9475, 9476, 9477, 9478, 9479, 9480, 9481, 9482, 9484, 9485, 9486, 9487, 9488, 9489, 9490.

15319. Do you know whether he has not failed lately?—I believe he has failed several times on the Royal Exchange.

15320. Has he ever failed on the Stock Exchange?—I believe he has.

15321. Do you know whether he signed any deed but the South Midland?—The Kent, Deptford and Dover; of 3, Trafalgar-place west, Hackney-road, broker, 2,000 *l.*

15322. Has he signed the City of London Railway?—Yes; Bonner's Hall 1,750 *l.*; the Westminster and Deptford Railway, Bonner's Hall, Hackney, gentleman, 1,000 *l.*; and the Thames Haven Railway, 2,000 *l.*

15323. Has he signed the South Western Railway deed?—I am not aware whether he has or not.

15324. Do you think he could raise the next call of 10 *s.* a share for the seventy shares he signed for in the South Midland?—From the knowledge I have of Blakemore, I should say decidedly not.

15325. Do you think he could raise 10 *l.*?—He might borrow 10 *l.*; I do not think he has 10 *l.* of his own.

15326. Mr. *Douglas.*] You say that Blakemore has failed several times on the Royal Exchange, do you mean he has failed in completing time bargains?—Yes.

15327. You do not mean he has become insolvent?—No; I mean the Bognor Improvement Company, to which he was secretary, and there might be other transactions; he failed to keep his word.

15328. Do you know anything of his private circumstances?—No; I only know him as a public man upon the Royal Exchange.

15329. You know nothing of his private resources?—No.

15330. Will you look at the endorsements upon these receipts? [*handing some papers to the Witness*]—I think they are his handwriting.

15331. Have you any doubt about it?—It does not appear to me to be the manner in which he signs it.

15332. You do not appear to entertain any doubt as to the signature to the deed?—No; there is a difference between them, and that raises the doubt; my opinion is that it is not his handwriting.

Mr. *John Gustard,* again called in; and further Examined.

Mr. *John Gustard.*

15333. Mr. *Douglas.*] Did you see Mr. Blakemore sign the deed, and also sign the bankers' receipt?—Yes, I did.

15334. Mr. *Vane.*] When did you see it?—The day he brought it into the office; I can give you the precise day, it was the 25th April 1836.

The bankers' receipt appeared to be dated the 2nd of April 1836, for 40 *l.* paid into Esdailes', and another receipt, dated the 30th of March, for 30 *l.* paid into the same bankers'.

15335. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Green.*)] Do you know Francisco Amadio?—I know him slightly.

15336. Do you know his writing?—No.

15337. Have you made inquiry at 18, Redcross-street, for him?—Yes, I have.

15338. Did you see him there?—Yes, I did.

15339. Did you ask him if he had signed the South Midland Counties Railway for 2,500 *l.*?—Yes.

15340. Did he admit he had?—Yes.

15341. Did you ask him whether he had paid the deposit?—I did.

15342. What did he say?—

Mr. *Douglas* objected to the evidence, and insisted that the party ought to be called.

Mr. *Vane* stated that he had been unable to summon the party.

The *Chairman* stated, if that was the case the evidence of Mr. Green might be received, and it might be struck out if it afterwards appeared means had not been taken to subpœna Francisco Amadio himself.

Mr.

Mr. *Vane* stated he could not say positively that the party had been summoned.

The *Chairman* stated that the conversation between Amadio and the witness might be received.

15343. Mr. *Vane.*] What did he say to you?—He said he had paid on the shares.

15344. Did you ask him if he was able to pay another call?—Yes, I did.

15345. What did he say?—He said the whole of the property in the shop belonged to his father, and he could not pay anything more.

15346. Did he state he had nothing to lose?—Yes, at the same time he stated it was the property of the father.

15347. Did you ask him whether he had signed the deed?—No, I did not ask him; he appears to have signed it.

15348. Mr. *Douglas.*] When did you make that inquiry of Francisco Amadio?—About a month ago I should say.

15349. Did you tell him for what purpose you made the inquiry?—I stated I came on behalf of the parties opposing the South Midland Railway; fancying there were certain names upon the deed that ought not to be there, I came to him to inquire whether he had signed the deeds before he paid the deposits as a shareholder. I told him distinctly to understand I came from a party opposing the line of road; that he was not bound to answer the questions unless he liked. He said he was sorry to say he had paid upon the shares; and when I stated there were likely to be further calls, he said, "The whole of the property in the shop belongs to my father, and I can pay nothing more;" or words to that effect.

15350. Who employed you to make those inquiries?—Mr. Vane.

15351. You mean Mr. Vane the solicitor here?—Yes.

15352. Did he tell you whether he had any other property?—Certainly not.

15353. *Chairman.*] Do you mean that he did not tell you, or say that he had not?—He did not tell me; I did not ask him.

15354. Mr. *Douglas.*] Did you tell him he might expect soon to have another call upon these shares?—Yes, I did.

15355. How did you know that?—I heard it stated on the Royal Exchange, which is a very excellent place to hear when calls are to be made.

15356. It was not likely that Amadio made this representation to you to induce the directors not to press him?—The inference I drew from it was this, that having paid the 50 *l.* upon the shares, and fearing he should be troubled, he stated that the property was the property of his father; and said, as for another call, I have nothing to lose.

15357. He stated to you he had paid 50 *l.* deposit?—Yes, he stated so.

15358. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you inquire at 118, St. John-street-road for Joseph Amadio?—I did.

15359. Did you see him there?—I did not.

15360. Who did you see?—I saw a person, who stated to me he was the father of Francisco Amadio; and I stated to him the circumstance, and he referred me to No. 18, Redcross-street.

15361. Did you ask the father whether Joseph Amadio, the son, had signed the South Midland Company for 30 shares?—Yes.

15362. What did he say?—He said he knew nothing at all about it.

15363. What is his father?—An optician.

15363*. Is he a pedlar?—He is a party that travels about from public-house to public-house with instruments he makes.

Mr. *Douglas* inquired whether attempts had been made to subpœna the father.

Mr. *Vane* stated, that no attempts had been made to summon Joseph Amadio.

15364. Mr. *Vane.*]—Do you know whether this is the same Amadio that has signed the City Railway?—I do not know; I have never seen the party.

15365. George A. Broad, Union-road, Clapham, gentleman, 120 shares, 6,000 *l.* Did you make inquiry in Union-road, Clapham, for Mr. Broad?—No, I did not.

15366. Do you know where Mr. Broad resides?—I do not know where he resides; I only know his residence by an admittance which he signed at Hampton Cottage, the Common-road, Peckham; that admittance was in writing, that he was a pauper, and that he had received 4 *s.* for signing the Kent and Dover Railway Company's deed for a sum of money he could not tell, and that his poverty compelled him to do so.

Mr. *John Gustard.*

8 May 1837.

15367. Could you tell his handwriting?—Yes.

15368. Mr. *Douglas.*] Is that admission in his writing?—Yes, it is; I have it not in my possession; you can send for it, or I can produce it to-morrow.

The *Witness* was directed to furnish the paper referred to, to the Chairman. [*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

15369. Mr. *Vane.*] Is that the signature of G. A. Broad?—Yes; in his writing.

15370. Do you know whether Broad is now hawking medicines or cigars about the town for sale?—I do not know he is now doing it.

15371. Have you seen him hawking things of that description?—Yes.

15372. How long since?—I have not been in the Royal Exchange to meet this man during the last three months; but in the last nine months he has been hawking drugs among chemists and selling them.

15373. Have you seen him lately?—I saw him some time ago on the Stock Exchange, and he told me he was actually starving.

15374. Have you sometimes lent him sums?—Yes.

15375. Large or small?—Small.

15376. State the sum?—Two shillings; and when I applied for the repayment, he stated he was in a state of starvation; and from his appearance I believe such to be the case.

15377. Do you know whether he has signed other deeds?—His name appears on other deeds.

15378. Do you believe it to be the same person?—Yes.

15379. 16, Hans-place, Clapham?—Yes.

15380. Do you think he is in a situation to pay the call of 10*s.* per share upon the shares he has taken in this company?—The last time I had any conversation with him, I am satisfied he was not in a situation to pay the 10*s.*

A returned twopenny-post letter, directed to Mr. Broad, was put in and noted, as not being to be found.

15381. Mr. *Douglas.*] Do you know Mr. Broad's handwriting?—Yes, I do.

15382. Look at that? [*handing a paper to the Witness*]—It appears to be in his handwriting, and it is signed for Mr. Blakemore.

15383. How do you mean that?—Blakemore has put his name upon it, and it is his share, and he has gone and signed for him.

15384. I do not see anything of that sort,' if you can enlighten me I shall be obliged to you?—There is his name, showing that the receipt belonged to Blakemore, and that Broad signed for him.

15385. You would infer, seeing the name of Blakemore on the corner of it, that they had been once in the possession of Blakemore?—Blakemore had it in his possession, and having signed the deed once, there was a difficulty in signing it a second time; he gives the receipt to Broad to show it is his property, and he puts his name upon it.

15386. *Chairman.*] That is your inference?—Yes.

15387. Do you know anything of it, or is it mere conjecture?—It is my conjecture from the mode in which the things are done.

15388. Mr. *Douglas.*] Your conjecture is, that Blakemore having signed the deed once, the company would not let him sign for any more?—Yes.

A bankers' receipt was produced, dated the 30th of March 1836, for 30*l.*; another receipt, dated 30th March 1836, for 20*l.*; another receipt, dated 28th March 1836, for 20*l.*; another receipt, dated 24th of March 1836, for 20*l.*; another receipt, dated 16th of March 1836, for 30*l.*

15389. *Chairman.*] Are they all marked with Mr. Blakemore's name?—No; I only speak of one signed by Mr. Blakemore,

15390. Mr. *Douglas.*] Is it not likely, though it might have been in the hands of Blakemore, he might have parted with it in the market?—Yes; or it might not have been Blakemore's property; he might be authorized to get the deed signed.

Mr. *John Gustard,* again called in; and further Examined.

15391. Mr. *Douglas.*] WHEN was it that Broad attended with those receipts?—The 25th of April 1836.

15392. Did Broad, at the time he produced those receipts, come to execute the deed in respect of them?—Yes, he did.

15393. *Chairman.*] Was he allowed to do so?—Yes.

15394. Were

15394. Were any questions asked of him?—No.

15395. Mr. *Vane.*] Did anything pass between you and Mr. Broad at the time he signed the deed?—No.

15396. Mr. *C. Lushington* (to Mr. *Green*).] Did you generally find a readiness on the part of those parties to whom you applied for information regarding their pecuniary connexion with the railways to answer your inquiries?—Generally speaking, they always felt a disposition to enter into the merits of the undertaking.

15397. Did you ever meet with a repulse?—Not in the South Midland; but in others I have.

15398. The general result of your inquiries was, that they were ready to answer your inquiries?—Yes.

15399. Does this result arise from the fact of such speculations being so frequent and notorious, and involving so little discredit in the scrutiny, such as you have described, that it occasioned no offence to the individual who might be questioned?—My opinion is, from calling upon those parties, they have entered into a speculation which their funds would not permit them to carry further into effect, and they would answer any question, that question having in view the defeating the company.

15400. They feel no offence upon the subject?—No; not in point of fact. I have met with the most courteous behaviour.

15401. Mr. *Douglas.*] Do you not know that the greatest part of those people had parted with their shares, and have no further interest in the company?—A great many of the parties I can allude to have sold their shares; they stated they took it for the express purpose of speculating; not for a *bonâ fide* purpose of carrying it into execution.

15401*. They would not care what became of the company?—No.

15402. Mr. *Vane.*] John Reed, 20, Baker-street, gentleman, 100 shares 5,000 *l.*; did you make inquiry after him?—Yes; I went to 20, Baker-street, Pentonville, and found out he had resided there but had left, he had been a lodger; the parties then in the house, upon my making the inquiry, were not the parties when he lived there, and the information they gave me was, they believed him to be a clerk in some merchant's counting-house in the city.

15403. Have you made any other attempt to find him out?—No.

A returned twopenny-post letter was delivered in, addressed to John Reid, and marked as not known.

Mr. *Douglas* produced a letter dated 20, Baker-street, Pentonville, the 22d March 1836, addressed to Messrs. Inkersoll, being an application for 50 shares in the South Midland Company, expressing his readiness to pay the calls, and abide by the rules of the company, and referring to two persons. Mr. Douglas also stated that a letter was written to him, informing him that he might have the shares upon paying the deposit.

Mr. *Douglas* put in the bankers' receipt, produced by Reid at the time of executing the deed, dated the 30th of March, for 50 *l.*, paid in to Messrs. Esdailes.

15404. Mr. *Vane.*] Had you a summons to serve, signed by the honourable Chairman of this Committee upon James Edwards, 17, Windsor-terrace, City-road?—Yes.

15405. Did you serve the summons?—I served it at the house on Friday night.

15406. With whom did you leave the summons?—With a person who stated she was the mother of Edwards.

15407. What did you tell the mother?—The mother stated to me it was not likely her son would be there that night; I stated the importance of it, that it was signed by the Chairman of a Committee of the House of Commons, and unless the parties attended to it they might get into difficulties, and I should advise her to see her son that night.

15408. Had you a summons to serve upon William Wright?—Yes.

15409. Did you attempt to serve it?—I went to the address, 16, Great Charlotte-street, Blackfriars-road, the place which he has described upon the South Midland deed.

15410. Who did you see there?—A person who represented herself to be Mrs. Warburton, the landlady of the house; she said that Wright had lived there, but it was at a distance of time, nearly three years. She stated that Mrs. Wright she considered a very ladylike woman, although very distressed; and she had called upon her, desiring her to take in all letters addressed to Wright, and, wishing her well,

Mr. *John Gustard.*

8 May 1837.

she took them in. Shortly afterwards Mrs. Wright called upon her and told her as she could not pay the postage she had better send them back.

15411. James Railton. Did you go to No. 2, Queen-street, Islington?—I did.

15412. Is that the address given upon the South Midland county list?—It is.

15413. Who did you see there?—I saw the brother of Mr. Railton, and his mother.

15414. Did you tell them to give him the summons?—I did.

15415. What did they say?—They stated they would.

15416. Did they tell you when he was likely to return home?—No, they did not.

The bankers' receipt in the case of Reid, dated 30th March 1836, for 50 *l.*, and another 25th March 1836, for 50 *l.*, were produced.

15417. Mr. *Douglas* (to Mr. *Gustard*).] When did Reid execute the deeds?—The 25th April 1836.

15418. Did he produce these receipts to you at the time?—Yes.

15419. Had you any reason to doubt they were his own property?—He paid them in his own name.

Mr. *James Henderson*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *J. Henderson.*

15420. Mr. *Vane.*] WHAT are you?—Clerk to Mr. Payne.

15421. Had you a summons for a William Hall on Saturday last?—Yes.

15422. Did you go to No. 8, Capel-court, Bank?—I went on Saturday last to 83, London-road, Southwark.

15423. What was the answer you got there?—That he did not reside there, and the hirer of the house did not know he ever had.

15424. Did you inquire at 8, Capel-court, Bank?—Yes.

15425. What answer did you get there?—That he was known there, but his chambers were not there; they then referred me to 16, Angel-court.

15426. Did you go there?—Yes.

15427. Who did you see there?—The occupier of the house, who is a shoemaker.

15428. Did you ask if they knew Hall there?—They told me that he was not within, but any paper I had for him they would take it.

15429. Did you leave the summons?—Yes.

15430. Had you any summons for William Redgrave?—Yes.

15431. Did you inquire at No. 2, Parliament-street?—Yes, I went into the chambers of Mr. Baine.

15432. What was the answer you got?—That he did not reside there, that he did no business there, that he occasionally came there, but was not within.

15433. Did you leave the summons there?—I did.

Mr. *Thomas Harrison*, called in; and Examined.

Mr. *T. Harrison.*

15434. Mr. *Vane.*] What are you?—Clerk to Mr. Vane.

15435. Had you a summons on Friday last, to serve upon Charles Fraser?—Yes.

15436. Where did you go to?—No. 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road.

15437. Who did you see there?—His wife.

15438. Did she tell you she was his wife?—Yes.

15439. Did you give her the summons?—Yes.

15440. Did you tell her to give it him?—Yes; and told her he had had another before, and that it would be of serious consequence to him if he did not attend.

15441. Was that the address given by him on the deed?—Yes.

Martis, 9° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. Thornely.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. Warburton.

MR. WARBURTON, IN THE CHAIR.

Thomas Green called in; and further Examined, as follows:

15442. Mr. *Vane.*] YOU were to produce a document, signed by Mr. Broad?—Yes; I have it.

[*The same was handed in to the Chairman.*]

15443. *Chairman.*] Under what circumstances was this paper given to you?—In consequence of having been engaged to go round and see a number of the applicants in the Kent Railway Company, those parties being afraid they had incurred a responsibility in so doing, gave a document showing it was their necessities compelled them to do so.

15444. Had you an interview with Mr. Broad?—Yes.

15445. And during that interview he gave you that paper?—Yes.

[*The following paper was delivered in:*]

"I, the undersigned, admit, on the 14th of February instant, I went to Mr. Castello, and for the consideration of 4*s.* that I signed the Parliamentary Contract and Deed in the Kent Railway Company as a shareholder for the amount of *l.* at the office of one Mr. Hammond, of the Commercial Sale-rooms, Mark-lane; that I was not at the time a shareholder, nor am I now; that Mr. Castello paid me the 4*s.* for so doing; that I had no interest, direct or indirect, other than receiving the said 4*s.*; that I was at the time of executing the said deeds, as well as at the present time, in great distress.

"Hampton Cottage, Com. Road, Peckham,
"21st February 1837. "*G. A. Broad.*"
"(Witness.) *T. Green.*"

15446. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you had a summons, signed by the Chairman of this Committee, to serve upon Vernon Prankard?—Yes.

15447. Did you go to 21, Castle-street, Finsbury?—I did.

15448. Did you find him there?—I did not.

15449. Did you try elsewhere?—Yes.

15450. Where did you so do?—I had found his name on one deed at 16, Park-place.

15451. Did you go there?—Yes.

15452. Did you find him there?—No; no such person has lived there since the party has been in the house.

15453. Do you know him?—Yes; I afterwards went back to Castle-street and left a notice for him.

15454. Do you know Prankard?—Yes, I do.

15455. Do you know his handwriting?—I cannot say that I do; I cannot speak positively to his writing.

15456. What is Prankard?—He is a jobber on the Royal Exchange.

15457. Has he ever been a defaulter there?—Yes.

15458. How long since?—He was a defaulter in the transactions in the South Cotton Company, which must have been four or five months ago.

15459. He has signed the South Midland Deed for 1,000 *l.*?—Yes.

 15460. Do

Thomas Green.

9 May 1837.

15460. Do you think he is capable of paying the next call of 10*s.* a share upon those shares?—Speaking of the knowledge I have of him three months ago, I should say he was not.

15461. Are you aware that he has signed any other deeds?—I find his name to the Westminster and Deptford, 16, Park-place, 1,000*l.* I find afterwards the same name in the Thames Haven and London, 2,000*l.* I find him in the South Western 1,500*l.*

15462. *Chairman.*] Do you know any second person of the name of Vernon Prankard as a jobber in shares?—No.

15463. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you ever hear of another person of that name?—No; I am not aware that I did.

15464. Are you aware he signed the Thames Haven deed for any other person?—He signed it by the desire of Charles Fraser, for a Mr. Amsinck, the secretary to the Company.

15465. *Chairman.*] Did he tell you this?—Mr. Fraser came upon the Royal Exchange to get parties to sign the deed, and they were to have a call for the shares after the second reading of the Bill. I refused to sign the deed, and stated at that time, which was about a year ago, that I would petition the House of Commons; but they prevailed upon me not to do it.

15466. Mr. *Douglas* (to Mr. *Gustard.*)] When did Prankard sign the deed of this company?—The 26th of April 1836.

15467. At that time did he produce to you those two receipts (*handing them to the Witness*)?—He did.

15468. Did he indorse his name upon them?—He did.

The receipts appeared to be dated the 16th of March 1836 for 10*l.* each.

15469. *Chairman.*] Do you know his handwriting?—No, I do not.

15469*. Mr. *Vane.*] Has he applied for shares?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes, he did for 20 shares.

15469†. *Chairman.*] Were they allotted?—Mr. *Douglas.*] No, they were not.

A letter from Prankard, dated the 25th of March 1836, was read, being an application for 20 shares, dated 21, Castle-street, Finsbury.

15470. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Green.*)] Do you know Charles Griffith, of 9, Myrtle-street, Hoxton?—No; I have made inquiry after him.

15471. Did you find any person named Charles Griffith residing there?—No; but I found the premises occupied by a person of the name of Griffith, who stated he was no relation to the party.

15472. Did he state he knew Charles Griffith?—Yes; but he was not any relation of his and did not lodge there, but had lodged there.

15473. *Chairman.*] How long ago?—About 12 months ago.

15474. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you ask also at Gloucester-place, Hackney?—No, I did not.

The bankers' receipts were produced in the case of Charles Griffith, dated the 26th of March, for 30*l.*, and another of the 26th of March for 30*l.*

15475. *Chairman.*] Did he apply for shares?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes, he did, but none were allotted to him.

The deed appeared to have been signed by Charles Griffith, the 25th of April.

15476. Mr. *Vane.*] "John Vincenty, Southwark-square, gentleman, 20 shares, 1,000*l.*" Did you inquire of several persons residing in and about Southwark-square for him?—I called twice and saw a person at No. 10, a Mr. Devy, who receives the rents of the houses in the square, and I could not find out such a person as John Vincenty. I called a second time with a notice, signed by Mr. Warburton for John Vincenty, and I began at No. 1 in the square and went to every house in the square by rotation, and I could not find that any person of that

that name had lived there; and if there had been any likelihoods of its finding him I intended to have stuck it up.

15477. Mr. *Bere.*] You inquired for Mr. Vincenty?—Yes.

15478. You did not inquire for a Mr. Vincent?—Yes; I inquired for Mr. Vincent, and he had lived at 17, Southwark-square.

15479. Did you find out where he had gone?—I found this morning that a person of the name of Vincent had gone to Bread-street to a person of the name of Short.

15480. When did you first find that a person of the name of Vincent had lodged there?—This morning.

15481. Did you inquire for Mr. Vincent as well as Vincenty?—No; when I got to 17, a person said that a person of the name of Vincent had lodged here.

15482. When did you find that out?—This morning.

15483. That inquiry you have not pursued further?—No.

A returned twopenny-post letter was put in, directed to J. Vincenti, Esq., Southwark-square, London, and marked as not found. It appeared that the deed was signed by John Vincent, and the bankers' receipts were also endorsed by the name of Vincent, the receipts being for 20*l.* from Mr. Vincent, and indorsed by Mr. Vincent, No. 17, Southwark-square.

15483*. *Chairman.*] Did he apply for shares?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes, 20 shares.

15483†. Were they allotted to him?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes, they were.

15484. Mr. *Vane.*] "George Robinson, White Conduit, Pentonville, 30 shares, 1,500*l.*" Did you make inquiry after George Robinson, at Pentonville?—I did.

15485. Of whom did you make the inquiries?—Of parties generally; shopkeepers and also twopenny postmen. I was introduced to a person of the name of Robinson, living near the White Conduit fields, who was a shoemaker in very indigent circumstances. He stated he had never signed a deed in his life. I asked him if he had signed the South Midland deed; he did not understand what I meant, and I knew he was not the person,

15486. Did you eventually find George Robinson?—Yes, I did.

15487. Where did you find him?—At No. 1, White Conduit-street, Pentonville. He stated to me he had paid upon the shares, and sold them at a great loss.

15488. Did you learn anything else with regard to his circumstances?—

Mr. *Bere* stated, that as the man was found, he ought to have been called to speak to his own circumstances.

I cannot state his circumstances; I do not know his circumstances; he is quite a stranger to me.

The letter of application was produced, dated the 5th of April, for 20 shares, and giving a reference.

15488.* *Chairman.*] Were any allotted to him?—Mr. *Douglas.*] No; he produced the bankers' receipt, endorsed by George Robinson, No. 1, White Conduit-street, Pentonville; and he signed the deed the 25th April.

15489. Mr. *Vane.*] William Redgrave, do you know anything of him?—I know nothing of him personally.

15490. Do you know he is a clerk to Mr. Baine?—I believe he is. I merely know Redgrave by having got his letters in my possession that I bought for penny and twopenny shares.

15491. Do you know him to be a letter-writer for shares?—I do not.

The bankers receipt was put in, upon which the party had signed himself William Redgrave. The letter of application for 40 shares was also put in, with reference to George Baine of Parliament-street, but none allotted; and he appeared to have signed the deed the 6th of May for 20 shares.

15492. Mr. *Vane.*] "George R. Medley, 9, Dobson-terrace, Kennington, 30 shares."

Thomas Green.

9 May 1837.

30 shares." Did you make inquiries at No. 9, Dobson-terrace, for Medley?—Yes, I did.

15493. Of whom did you make the inquiry?—Of the party in the house, who was a female.

15494. Was her name Mrs. Snowden?—I do not know her name.

15495. Did you ask her if Medley lived there?—Yes; her answer was no, and she did not remember the name. I then went and inquired about the neighbourhood, and learnt that a person of the name of Medley had lived at that house.

15496. *Chairman.*] How long ago?—About 10 months; that persons of the name of Brine and Medley had lived there, and both ran away; and she referred me to the landlord of the house in a place called Green-street, Dobson-terrace. I went there, and the landlord was in bed and not to be seen; and from what I learnt of the party in the house, he was not altogether right in his mind, and I could get no further information.

15497. Mr. *Bere.*] Did you inquire whether he had left the country?—No, I did not.

15498. Did you inquire of any of them whether they knew he was residing in that neighbourhood?—I did.

15499. Did they tell you?—They gave me a piece of paper with the address of themselves on it; they gave me their addresses in case I ever met with Medley to drop them a twopenny-post letter, and that they would follow him.

15500. I ask you if they gave you any place where they thought you might find Medley?—No; they wished to find him themselves.

15501. They gave you no address of Medley?—No.

15502. Did you ask them for any?—Yes.

15503. Did you make any inquiry of any of the parish officers?—No, I did not.

A twopenny-post letter, addressed G. R. Medley, 9, Dobson-terrace, Kennington, London, appeared to have been returned as not known. A bankers' receipt for 5 *l.*, dated 25th March 1836 was produced, and also another for 25 *l.*; and it appeared by the bankers' book that those five shares were paid for by Henry Ellis, Bank-street, Paddington, who was the only person who had paid 5 *l.* in on that day.

15504. Mr. *Vane.*] Charles Moring, 7, Ferdinand-terrace, Hampstead-road; do you know him?—Yes, I do.

15505. Mr. *Bere.*] You know him personally?—I do.

15506. Mr. *Vane.*] Is his name Maring or Moring?—I have always known him go by the name of Moring.

15507. What is he?—A jobber.

15508. Is he a share-hunter?—He is a person who writes for shares, but not to so great an extent as the other parties I have been speaking of.

15509. Has he ever failed?—Yes.

15510. How long ago?—He has failed in the last two years.

15511. What are his circumstances, do you know?—His circumstances are like the rest of the jobbers; he gets his living by writing for shares, and buying and selling shares for persons; sometimes he may earn a good deal of money, and at other times be in a very distressed state.

15512. He signed the South Midland for 50 shares; do you think he can pay the next call of 10 *s.* a share?—If the money was to come from himself, I believe he would not; but some of his principals would advance him the money if required.

15513. Would they advance it if the shares were at a discount?—No.

15514. Mr. *Bere.*] Who are his principals?—The persons who employ him.

15515. Who are they?—I never looked into his private books.

15516. When you say they would advance the money, do you know who they are?—I have seen them with him, and I have seen them advancing him money; and I have no hesitation in saying that that 50 *l.* was advanced by his principals.

15517. Do you mean that he signed for some respectable stockbroker for those

those 50 shares?—I do not say a stockbroker, but some person who employed him for that purpose.

15518. Do you believe he signed the deed for some person of respectability?—I cannot say who the person was; if you will tell me the man, I will tell you whether he is respectable.

15519. Do you not suppose his principals to be respectable?—There are many men on the Royal Exchange who can advance 50*l.* or 200*l.*, but I do not call them respectable.

15520. Have you known him some time?—Ever since I have been on the Royal Exchange.

15521. Do you mean he has been a defaulter on the Royal Exchange?—He has not paid the difference upon his time transactions.

15522. Does that happen to many men who are able to pay again?—I do not think it happens to many men, because they never pay again.

15523. That is the general rule?—Yes.

15524. And you mean to say that Medley having been once a defaulter, will never have credit again?—No; if a man is a defaulter he does not pay the difference; but after a certain time he goes upon the Royal Exchange, and his credit is as good ever; there are few men there who have not been defaulters; I may say there are none.

15525. *Chairman.*] In that line of business?—Yes.

15526. Mr. *Bere.*] He is in the same situation as the rest?—The same as myself.

15527. Do you know anything of Moring's private circumstances?—No.

15528. Were you ever in his house?—No.

15529. Do you know whether he carries on any other business besides that of jobber?—No.

15530. Have you ever been at the house to see?—No, never.

The bankers' receipt was produced, indorsed Charles Moring, for 50*l.*, and it appeared he had signed the deed the 30th of April.

15531. Mr. *Vane.*] "William Taylor, 104, Tyssen-place, Kingsland, 80 shares, 4,000*l.*;" do you know William Taylor?—I do.

15532. What is he?—At this present time he is clerk to a person of the name of Northover, on the Stock Exchange.

15533. Does he reside there with his mother?—He resides at 104, Tyssen-place, Kingsland-road, with his mother.

15534. Do you know anything of his circumstances?—I have known Mr. Taylor for the last three years; and until he got into that situation with Mr. Northover, his circumstances were extremely humble, dependent on his mother.

15535. Have your ever lent him small sums of money?—I have.

15536. State what sums?—I could not particularize any sum; it was some time ago.

15537. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by small sums?—Such as 1*s.*, 1*s.* 6*d.*, 2*s.*, 2*s.* 6*d.*, or 5*s.*

15538. Mr. *Vane.*] You recollect sometimes you have lent him those sums?—Yes.

15539. He is called a stockbroker?—Yes.

15540. Mr. *Bere.*] Have you ever been at his house?—No, but I have passed the mother's house with him.

15541. Do you know his mother?—I do not.

15542. Do you know whether she is a person having any property?—She is a person living upon an annuity, her husband having been a clerk in the Bank of England.

15543. You say you have lent him some small sums of money; will you state the time?—I cannot state the time.

15544. Within two years?—Yes, within 12 months.

15545. What have you lent him?—2*s.* 6*d.*, or 2*s.*, or 3*s.* or 4*s.*

15546. Has he paid you again?—Yes.

15547. Where were you when you lent it him?—In the skittle-grounds at different times.

15548. The money you have lent him has been in skittle-grounds when at play?—Yes, and other places.

15549. Where?—The Royal Exchange and at the Auction Mart Tavern.

Thomas Green.

9 May 1837.

15550. Tell me when you lent him any money last?—In the last 12 months.

15551. What did you lend him?—1 *s.* 6 *d.*, or 2 *s.* I might say.

15552. You might say 1,000 *l.*—No, I could not do that.

15553. Will you say in the last 12 months you have lent him 1 *s.*?—I could not say 1 *s.*

15554. It is indifferent to you?—It is not indifferent to me.

15555. Has he ever lent you any money?—Never.

15556. Have you ever had transactions with him dealing in shares?—I do not think I ever had.

15557. Do you mean to state positively you have not?—Yes, I had one in the Gravesend and Stroud; I bought five shares of him, and that was the only transaction I ever had with him in my life to the best of my recollection.

15558. When was that?—Twelve months ago I should say.

15559. Did you pay him 5 *l.*?—No, there was 1 *l.* paid, and I bought them at three-eighths or one-half.

15560. What did you pay him?—1 *l.* 17 *s.* 6 *d.* if they were at three-eighths, or 2 *l.* 10 *s.* if they were at one-half.

[*The application of William Taylor for* 20 *shares was put in.*]

15560.* *Chairman.*] Were they allotted to him?—Mr. *Douglas.*] No.

The bankers' receipt was produced for 50 *l.*, dated 28th March, and another for 30 *l.*, dated the 30th March, and indorsed William Taylor, 104, Tyssen-place, Kingsland, and it appeared he signed the deed the 26th of April.

15561. Mr. *Vane.*] "William Hamilton, 15 George-street, Lambeth, 100 shares, 5,000 *l.*" Do you know him?—I do.

15562. Do you know his handwriting?—I do. [*The deed was shown to the Witness.*] It appears to me to be his handwriting.

15563. Does he reside at 15, George-street, Lambeth?—He does.

15564. What sort of house is it?—A small house.

15565. What is Mr. Hamilton?—He has stated to me he is a partner in a gambling house in the Quadrant, No. 56.

15566. I observe that William Hamilton signs several railway lists, and gives his address, 56, Quadrant, coal merchant; is that the same person?—He has stated to me he is that person.

15567. He has signed the London and Brighton, giving that address?—Yes, for 1,000 *l.*, and the City and Richmond Railway at Lambeth.

15568. Mr. *Bere.*] What are you speaking from?—From my memorandum taken from the Subscribers' Contract.

15569. Mr. *Vane.*] Did he tell you he had signed those deeds?—I had occasion to wait upon him upon the City and Richmond Railway, and made the inquiries of him, and he stated he had signed that deed, he was the party signing the deed.

15570. What are his circumstances?—His circumstances are not good.

15571. Is it your opinion he can raise the call of 10 *s.* per share upon the 100 shares he holds in this company, supposing the shares were at a discount?—For me to answer the question whether he could raise it, a man who moves in the life he does, it would be very easy, but whether he could pay it is another question.

15572. Do you think he could pay it himself?—I think he could not.

15573. Has he admitted to you he could not?—He has admitted to me he has been very hard up.

15574. Mr. *Bere.*] When was that?—In the last three weeks.

15575. Have you ever been in that gambling house?—Never.

15576. Is it carried on now?—I believe it is; I do not know personally of my own knowledge.

15577. Do you know whether he deals in coal?—I do not know.

15578. Do you know anything of his private circumstances?—No more than having called at his house, and I have found him there.

15579. Where is that?—15, George-street, Lambeth.

15580. Does he live there with his family?—He has no family.

15581. Does

Thomas Green.

9 May 1837.

15581. Does he occupy the house?—No; it is a house of one story high, and he is a lodger.

15582. How do you judge he is a lodger?—I judge from the circumstance, he was up stairs in bed.

15583. You told me yesterday you could not judge from the appearance of a house whether a man was a lodger?—He was up stairs in bed, and the person at the house invited me into the parlour down stairs; she was an elderly lady, and she remained there all the time.

15584. Because he was up stairs in bed, and you were invited by an elderly lady into the room down stairs, you concluded he was a lodger?—Yes.

The letter of application for 100 shares was produced and read, dated from 56, Quadrant, Regent-street, 21st March, 1836, addressed to Messrs. Percivals.

The bankers' receipt was produced, signed Messrs. Esdailes, for 100 *l.* indorsed William Hamilton, George-street, Lambeth, who also signed the deed the 25th of April, and it appeared he paid the 100 *l.* in his own name into the bankers.

15585. From your knowledge of Mr. Hamilton, do you believe him capable, in April 1836, of paying 100 *l.*?—I believe him to be as capable then as now.

15586. Do you believe him to be as capable now as in 1836?—Yes, I do.

15587. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you had a summons to serve upon Charles Williams, 37, Old Broad-street?—Yes.

15588. Did you apply there?—Yes.

15589. Did you leave the summons there?—I left it with a youth of the name of Haynes, in the Polborow Mining Company's office.

15590. Did you ask anything about Williams there?—I asked about him, and they said he was no longer a clerk in that establishment.

15591. Did you learn he had been a clerk in that establishment?—I did not learn he had been a clerk there.

15592. You had a summons to serve upon Henry Allanson, 31, Castle-street, Holborn?—Yes, I had.

15593. Had you also a summons to serve upon Benjamin Day?—I had four summonses, Allanson, Day, and the two Amadios. I served Francisco Amadio personally, and Joseph's I left at the house, 118, John-street Road.

15594. You left it yesterday?—Yes; after the Committee rose, about seven o'clock.

15595. Have you ever dealt in the shares of this company?—I have.

15596. Did you purchase any in 1836?—I did.

15597. What month; can you recollect?—In the month of May or June.

15598. Do you recollect the price you gave?—I bought them of a person of the name of Grey, in Capel-court, for the coming out; I bought the shares for the coming out, the bankers' receipt being out and kept by Grey for the purpose of delivering the scrip.

15599. *Chairman.*] You were to deliver the scrip?—I bought the shares of Grey, Grey having the shares in his possession; it was the bankers' receipt.

15600. You bought with the intention of selling again?—Yes; to job in them.

15601. Had you undertaken to deliver scrip?—I was the buyer, and the party has the receipts in his hands. I tell him, I will give you one-half premium upon their coming out.

15602. Mr. *Bere.*] You bought the scrip before it was out?—Yes.

15603. Mr. *Vane.*] What was the price?—Half premium, 10*s.* the premium.

15604. What month was it in?—I should say in the month of May or June.

15605. Have you ever dealt in those shares since that time?—Yes.

15606. At what prices have you ever bought or sold them for?—I have bought them at one-eighth discount, and one-fourth discount.

15607. Do you know the price of these shares at this time?—The prices of these shares at this time are about 2*s.* to 4*s.* per share.

15608. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you know who signed the deed for those shares you bought of Grey?—No.

15609. Are you at all able to fix the time more distinctly when you made that

Thomas Green.

9 May 1837.

that bargain for scrip, whether it was in May or June?—I should say myself it was in May, the latter end of May.

15610. Was it during the time the Midland Committee was sitting, and this company appearing before that Committee as an opposition line, and before the determination of that Committee was known?—I cannot tell; there had been a sudden rise in the shares before I bought them.

15611. Was it after the report of the Committee or not?—I cannot tell.

15612. I take for granted you gentlemen jobbers watch the proceedings of Committees, to judge of the value of the shares?—Yes; certainly.

15613. You cannot give me that information?—No.

15614. You named the present price of shares; have you bought any lately?—No; but I was offered them at that price by a stockbroker.

15615. When?—Yesterday.

15616. When before yesterday?—I have not been jobbing during the last three months.

15617. Have you had any offered to you between the transaction with Mr. Grey and yesterday?—Yes; I have had some offered me.

15618. When?—I cannot tell; a person who has had an immense quantity of transactions cannot recollect every one.

15619. In the last three months you have not bought any?—No; nor in the last six months.

15620. Who offered them to you yesterday?—Mr. Stokes.

15621. The gentleman who was examined here?—Yes.

15622. Did Mr. Stokes know you were making inquiries as unfavourable as you could of this company?—He knew I was getting up evidence; I asked him the price, with the intention of buying them if I could get them for next akin to nothing.

15623. Did you really intend to buy them?—Yes, I did.

15624. Were you prepared to pay up the 10*s.*?—No, I should not have bought them with that intention.

15625. You have the capability of paying that sum?—I am capable of buying them.

15626. Are you capable of paying that 10 *s.*?—Yes, or 40*s.*

15627. With the assistance of the money that you are to get here?—Without the assistance of any one.

15628. Have you been a defaulter?—Yes.

15629. Often?—No, once.

15630. When was that?—Seven months ago.

15631. Have you recovered your credit?—It is as good as it ever was.

15632. It was always very good?—Always.

15633. Is it known on the Exchange that you frequent gambling-houses?—I make no secret of it; I was never there more than five times in my life.

15634. Did it injure your credit?—No; they are in the habit of going there generally themselves.

15635. The whole of them?—I speak generally.

15636. Are the South Midland Company's shares the only shares that have fallen in the market?—Certainly not.

15637. Have some shares fallen as much as 30 per cent.?—Yes.

15638. Railway shares?—Yes.

15639. Has there not been a great depression in all shares in the last spring?—Yes.

15640. Do you know the price of the Midland Counties' shares?—They are at a discount I believe.

15641. Are you well acquainted with those who were subscribers to the Great Western?—I am acquainted with parties who wrote for shares for the Great Western.

15642. A vast number of those persons whose names you have mentioned to-day and yesterday, were not they writers for shares in the Great Western?—Certainly.

15643. Were not they owners of shares in the Great Western?—I cannot state.

15644. Were not they writers for shares in the London and Birmingham?—Yes, generally in all companies.

15645. And have dealt largely in shares?—In letters.

Thomas Green.

9 May 1837.

15646. Do you mean to confine it to letters; do you mean you do not know whether they have had shares in the companies?—Some of them have; not all of them.

15647. Some of the gentlemen you have been speaking of?—Yes; I should say that Mr. Stokes has dealt largely in all the companies.

15648. Are they in the habit of dealing in shares upon which a large capital has been paid up?—No, certainly not; when there is the sum of 1*l.* paid, and it is a favourite scheme, and they can job in it; but where there are 5*l.* paid, the little men cannot get at them.

15649. Mr. *Bere.*] Is it not usual to call for a deposit of 1*l.* upon Railway shares?—No, certainly not.

15650. What is it?—£.5.

15651. Mention any one where 5*l.* was paid?—The first deposit paid on the Great Western was 5*l.*

15652. Will you undertake to say that?—Yes, to the best of my belief.

15653. And yet a good number of these persons were applicants for shares?—Yes, but they have not paid it up.

15654. Were any of them shareholders?—I do not know.

15655. Mention any other company in which a greater deposit was paid than 1*l.* a share?—If you will let me look at the contracts, I can tell; the South Durham Railway 2*l.* 10*s.* deposit; and here is the City and Richmond, 2*l.* 10*s.*; Westminster Bridge and Deptford, 2*l.*

15656. Mr. *Vane.*] You have stated you have been a defaulter once; I presume you have made good those losses?—It is not the system to make good. If I was to go and pay, having been a defaulter, I should be doing an injury to myself, because the party who has been a defaulter to me never dreams of such a thing.

15657. Do you know whether in the North Midland Counties the deposit was 5*l.*?—Yes, my apprehension is that it was.

15658. Do you also know whether the deposit upon the Midland Counties was 5*l.* before they came to Parliament?—I have never heard what that was.

15659. Have you ever heard of a call of 10*s.* per share for a Railway?—Never.

15660. Mr. *Bere.*] Did you ever know the money market in the condition in which it is now since 1825?—Not in railways.

15661. Looking at the money market generally?—The money market is generally now in a very good state, but the railway shares have depreciated it; when I state the money market is in a very good state, I go by the price of consols, they are 90¾, and that I consider a very good price.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Gifford* was called in; and Examined as follows:

Mr. *William Gifford.*

15662. *Chairman.*] YOU are a messenger of The House?—Yes.

15663. Have you inquired for Charles Fraser, 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road?—I have. I called there; he was not at home; I thought the best way would be to deliver the order to him very early, and I delivered the order at half-past six; but he went out half an hour before I was there; he was there last night at 11 o'clock, and he goes out sometimes for two or three days together.

[The Witness withdrew.

Various documents were delivered in by Mr. *Douglas*, pursuant to the order of the Chairman.

15664. *Chairman.*] Have you the names of the parties appointed to make allotments of shares?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes, I have; Mr. Thomas Coglan, stockbroker and general agent at Liverpool, was authorized by the directors to make an allotment of 2,000 shares amongst the most respectable applicants at Liverpool; Messrs. Redsdale, stockbrokers at Leeds, were appointed by the directors to make an allotment of 2,000 shares amongst the most respectable applicants at Leeds and the neighbourhood; and Mr. David Holt, stockbroker, Manchester, in the same manner and to the same amount, amongst the applicants at Manchester. The bankers mentioned in the first prospectus had, at the formation of the company, authority to allot shares at their discretion to applicants in their immediate neighbourhood, but this authority was revoked

9 May 1837.

the 13th of April 1836; when I state it was revoked, I should give this explanation, that letters were written to the bankers desiring them not to allot any more shares; and I find from the minute-books that letters were written to the bankers, informing them that they were not to allot any more shares, or receive any more money; it was in answer to a letter from Messrs. Percivals, and also from Messrs. Paget, to say that some money had been sent in, and to know whether they were to return it, and they were ordered to return it, and it was returned. I can speak to one sum of 100 *l.* at Messrs. Percevals, and I think 200 *l.* or 300 *l.* at Leicester. Prior to the 13th April 1836, allotments were made to London applicants by the directors at their different meetings, but on that day Messrs. Nunneley, Mills, and Godfrey, three members of the directory, were appointed as a sub-committee to make a selection from the applicants, to whom further shares were to be allotted, and no other shares were allotted after the 13th of April 1836, with the exception of a very few shares at Leicester.

15665. *Chairman.*] According to the best of your belief it was so?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes; Mr. Gustard can give more information upon that than I can probably; 10 allotments of shares appear to have been made after that time, of 232 shares.

15666. The number of shares you have stated includes those?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Yes; I stated in my examination something with regard to Mr. Erck having revised the list; in addition to which I should state that Mr. Lawson of Bush-lane was employed to revise the lists. We have applied to see Mr. Lawson, and have not been able to meet with him; he was a person employed to investigate the list of applicants, and was paid the sum of 10 guineas for doing so.

15667. Mr. *Vane* (to Mr. *Douglas.*)] You say that Messrs. Coglan at Liverpool, and Redesdale at Leeds, and Holt at Manchester, were authorized to allot shares?—Yes, they were.

15668. Do you know whether they ever made any inquiry?—They were directed to allot them to the most respectable people, and I know Mr. Coglan to be a highly respectable man, and a member of the common council at Liverpool.

15669. Do you know what method he pursued in alloting shares?—No, I do not.

15670. You say the bankers were also authorized to allot shares, and that that authority was revoked?—Yes.

15671. Will you show me the minute-book in which that is entered?—I see a resolution on the 13th April 1836,—Resolved, that a circular be sent to each of the applicants for shares, stating, that owing to the numerous applications for shares beyond the capital required, that no further shares would be allotted at present. Then it was resolved that notice be sent to Mr. Coglan, to Mr. Redesdale, and Mr. Holt, and the accompanying letter to the London applicants, stating that no further shares would be allotted at present. Sir Arthur Brooke was in the chair, and Mr. Perceval was present, and Mr. Goddard was also present, and I speak more particularly to Mr. Pattison and Mr. Kirby, for I received a letter from them.

15672. You say there was a minute made on that day, desiring the bankers not to allot shares?—It was general that no more should be allotted, and two of the bankers were present, and the next day letters were sent to Messrs. Paget to return the money.

15673. Was any resolution made to order the return of the money?—Yes, I think there was.

15674. What day was it?—At a meeting held on the 4th of May 1836.

15675. Where?—19, Charing-cross, Sir Arthur Brooke in the chair, Mr. Barwell, Mr. Clark, Mr. Nunnelley, Mr. Mills, Mr. Sharpe and Mr. Ord; and one of the resolutions was, that all persons sending their money to the bankers for shares before they are allotted to them, that the bankers be ordered to return the same, and the secretary be directed to write to them to that effect.

15676. You say that the allotments made to the London applicants were made by the directors?—No; I think this was before the company was formed on the 1st of March. The Midland Counties Bill went into committee on the 10th, and when we assembled in London for the first 10 days I should think the shares were allotted by the directors present.

15677. You

15677. You have stated that allotments were made to the London applicants by the three directors you have named, Mr. Mills, Mr. Nunnelley and Mr. Godfrey?—They were appointed a sub-committee. I will refer to the resolution itself, "Proposed by Mr. Ellis and seconded by Mr. Percival, that 1,800 shares be further appropriated among the applicants already received; that Mr. Mills, Mr. Godfrey and Mr. Nunnelley be deputed to allot the same."

15678. Does that apply only to the London applicants?—I am sure I do not know; I have read the resolution; they are not my drawing, and I was not present.

15679. You have stated that the allotments made to the London applicants were made by those three persons?—No; they were appointed a sub-committee to allot shares.

15680. *Chairman.*] In consequence of that appointment, were they the parties who did allot shares?—I am not aware that any other shares, except the 10 Mr. Gustard referred to, were allotted after that time.

15681. Mr. *Vane.*] Who allotted the London shares?—At the different meetings of the committee it was done.

15682. By whom?—The directors.

15683. You have named Mr. Mills, Mr. Nunnelley and Mr. Godfrey?—Yes, as being the persons at that time to make any further allotments, but none others were made.

15684. Who made the previous allotments?—I should presume the directors themselves.

15685. Can you tell by referring to the book?—No; we have no minutes by us of the first several meetings held. We have a minute book kept by Dr. Hopkinson, and from the statements laid before the committee it appeared that the following shares had been allotted. In London, the deposits paid to Messrs. Esdaile, 5,200 *l.*; Northampton, J. and S. Percival, 1,400 *l.*; at Market Harborough, to Kersole & Company, 675 *l*; Leicester, Paget & Company, 500 *l*; Stamford, 400*l.*; Liverpool, say 2,500*l.*; Manchester, say 2,500*l.*; Leeds and Yorkshire, 2,500 *l.*

15686. Mr. *Vane.*] What do you mean by stating "say" so many shares?—I give it you as it appears upon the minute of the directors; I cannot give any further explanation.

15687. Can Mr. Gustard give any explanation?—Mr. *Gustard.*] They only put the numbers down, what they supposed would be allotted.

15688. Mr. *Vane.*] On what was that supposition grounded?—From the number of applications which had been received.

15689. Then, do I understand you, you included all the applications?—We put them down in round numbers, and the amounts were corrected by a subsequent return.

15690. Were you present at all the meetings that were held?—Mr. *Douglas.*] The 13th of April 1836 was the first meeting held after the secretary was appointed.

15691. That was after the shares had been allotted?—Yes, it was.

15692. Have you any minutes of any previous resolutions or meetings that were held between the 1st of March and the 13th of April?—

15693. *Chairman.*] Who kept the minutes before the 13th of April?—Mr. *Douglas.*] Each chairman appears to have kept minutes of what was done at each meeting. Here is a book in the handwriting principally of Dr. Hopkinson, the mayor of Stamford. He appears to have presided at the first meeting, and here is his minute; the rest is in the handwriting of Mr. Newcomb.

15694. Mr. *Vane.*] Does that book relate to the general affairs of the company, or to the meetings at Stamford?—These are the meetings in London.

15695. *Chairman.*] Does any entry appear in this early minute book of the manner in which the shares had been allotted previously to the 13th of April?—No, I believe not at those first meetings, though we had three professional men employed; they had not time to attend them during the opposition of the Midland Counties Bill.

15696. Mr. *Vane.*] Do you recollect being present at a meeting when Mr. Ellis was present?—I suppose it is the 13th of April.

15697. Previous to that do you recollect a conversation, and some disagreement amongst the directors as to the mode of allotting shares?—Yes.

9 May 1837.

15698. Will you state the time?—I should think it was this meeting of the 13th of April; I think Mr. Ellis made an observation on looking over the list; I think at that time the committee were looking over the different applications made, and Mr. Ellis made some observations, complaining that he thought we had allotted some shares to some improper applicants; in consequence of that I believe this resolution was passed, empowering Mr. Mills, Mr. Godfrey, and Mr. Nunnelley to revise the list of applicants, and separate them into different lists, and employ some person to give them information.

15699. *Chairman.*] Who complained of the shares having got into improper hands?—Mr. Ellis said, on looking over the list, he was afraid it was so.

15700. Mr. *Vane.*] Did Mr. Grantham say anything to that effect?—I think not; I think it very likely.

15701. I believe the conversation was previously?—I believe not; it is also very probable that at Northampton Mr. Percival, who presided at some of those meetings, may have some minutes of what passed, but not anything in detail.

15702. You have stated that the shares were allotted before the 13th of April, except a few shares at Leicester, to about 10 persons. Mr. Ellis's remonstrance, therefore, could have very little avail?—I think it shows it did avail considerably, for no more shares were allotted.

15703. Then the appointment of Messrs. Mills, Nunnelley, and Godfrey has never been acted upon; they have never acted upon it?—No.

A letter was read from the letter book of the company, dated 5th May 1836, directed to Messrs. Percival & Co., Northampton, and signed by the secretary, stating "Mr. Hall's letter has been laid before the committee, and they have directed me to request you will return him his 200*l.*, and if any other person should apply for shares, and send his money, the simple way will be to return the money upon the receipt of it." Another letter, directed to Richard Hall, of Barton House, near Bristol, of the 5th of May 1836, was read, containing in substance an acknowledgment of the receipt of a letter from him respecting the 200*l.*, and acquainting him that instructions had been given to the bankers to return it; and on the same date a letter was sent to Paget & Co., bankers at Leicester, signed by the secretary, in which they are requested to return 100*l.* to Mr. Hall, and if any other person should send in money, in like manner to return it, on the receipt of it.

15704. (To Mr. *Gustard.*) Had you a list of the persons to whom shares were allotted before you, when the persons came to sign the deed?—Yes, I had a list.

15705. Did you refer to that list?—Sometimes I did; I cannot say I did in every case.

15706. Did you do it generally?—I think I did generally.

15707. Had you any instructions to waive the order that they should bring the letter of allotment?—No, I did not have any instructions at all upon the subject.

15708. *Chairman.*] You mean to say in most cases, but not always you referred to the list?—Yes.

15709. Did you consider the bankers' receipt a sufficient authority to allow any party to sign the deed?—Yes.

15710. Mr. *Bere.*] Was there a discussion in the committee upon these bankers' receipts?—Yes, there was.

15711. *Chairman.*] At what time?—I think about the 23d of April.

15712. Mr. *Bere.*] Had any persons come with bankers' receipts, and said anything with respect to their right to have their names put upon the deed?—Yes; when they first came I asked them if they had been allotted to them, and referred to the book, no names being upon the receipt, and could not find them; they told me they had purchased them in the market, and that it was the custom in every company to allow them to sign, and after some discussion we were obliged to let them sign it.

15713. Discussion with whom?—With the members in town.

15714. *Chairman.*] You brought the matter before them?—Yes.

15715. And informed them what had passed?—Yes.

15716. What

9 May 1837.

15716. What were the instructions they gave to you?—That whoever brought a receipt I must let them sign.

15717. Mr. *Bere.*] Did the Committee come to that resolution after discussing the question of the right of the persons having bankers' receipts to sign?—Yes.

15718. Did they come to the opinion that they were bound to let them sign?—Yes.

15719. *Chairman.*] Do you mean to say that they came to the resolution that they had a right to sign, or that it was expedient to allow them to sign?—They claimed the right to sign, as it was the custom in all companies.

15720. Who said so?—The persons who brought the receipts.

15721. What took place before the meeting of the committee upon the subject; did they allow them to sign because they considered the persons who applied to sign had a right to sign, or because the members of the committee thought it expedient to allow them to sign?—They thought they had a right to sign.

15722. Was the question of right a matter of discussion before the board?—Yes, it was.

15723. Was Mr. Torkington, one of the solicitors to the board, present upon that occasion?—Yes.

15724. Did he give any opinion upon the subject?—I suppose he did; I do not know.

15725. Was the question put to him whether the parties who had bought bankers' receipts in the market had a right to sign?—Yes.

15726. Is Mr. Torkington a solicitor in London?—No, in the country; the town-clerk of Stamford.

15727. Was he aware, previously to this meeting, of the practice prevailing of allowing parties, whether shares had been allotted to them or not, if they had bought shares in the market, to sign?—I dare say he was; I cannot say for certain; this discussion took place on the first day.

15728. Was a legal opinion asked by the directors from him, whether these parties had a legal right to sign or not?—I do not know that the question was particularly put to him. He attended with the other members of the committee, and they discussed it generally; and they came to the conclusion that whoever bought the receipts, of course, must sign it.

15729. Did one of the directors, Mr. Clark, object to it, and say they had no right?—No.

15730. (To Mr. *Douglas.*) Did you hear of this question being raised before the London committee, as to parties not having shares allotted to them, but producing bankers' receipts, having a right to sign?—I heard of the discussion upon the subject; it was discussed also down in the country.

15731. Did you hear any person, connected with the company, express an opinion that they had not a right to sign?—Yes; Mr. Clark, one of the directors; he was at Harborough, and asked my opinion upon it, and my answer was, that we should insist upon the parties, to whom the shares were originally allotted, signing the deed, and then a difficulty arose from the bankers' receipt not specifying the names of the parties paying the money, and when Mr. Clark got up to town it was discussed, and the opinion of Mr. Torkington was taken, and finding what was done in other companies, they thought they had no right to prevent parties signing the deed who held bankers' receipts.

Mr. *Daniel Edward Stephens,* called in; and further Examined, as follows:

Mr. *D. E. Stephens.*

15732. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—Chingford, in Essex.

15733. Were you employed by me some time ago to make inquiries after several of the subscribers to the South Midland Counties Railway?—Yes; I was.

15734. "John Charles Ord." Did you go to 172, Regent-street, to inquire after Mr. Ord?—Yes; I did.

15735. What was the answer?—The answer was that he did lodge there with Mr. Cole, but had gone away, and they could not say where.

A letter, directed J. C. Ord, was produced as returned by the two-penny post, and marked as "gone away and not known where."

Mr. *D. E. Stephens.*

9 May 1837.

15736. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you know anything of Mr. Ord?—No, I do not; the first time I called there, the party I saw told me he had lodged there with Cole and had gone away, they could not say where.

15737. Did you inquire whether they were persons of property?—No; I did not there.

15738. Did you anywhere else?—No.

15739. You did not ask what station of life they were moving in?—No; I did not.

15740. Did you find that Mr. Cole had been lodging there too?—Yes; the answer was that Mr. Ord did lodge there with Cole; they had gone away, but they could not say where; in fact he knew the parties had come into the house 10 or 12 months.

15741. The persons of whom you got that information were not the parties who lived there when Mr. Ord and Mr. Cole did?—I do not know.

15742. Did you ask whether Mr. Cole had lodged with him, or in that house?—I asked them if he had lodged with him, and they said he had not.

15743. Did you make any inquiry as to the persons who had the house before?—No.

15744. You made no inquiry into their condition?—They could give me no answer.

15745. For aught you know they may be men of substance?—I know nothing of them.

15746. Mr. *Vane.*] It is said that Mr. Cole is a man of fortune; do you know whether he was secretary to the Southend Railway?—I cannot say so of my own knowledge; I have heard so.

15747. Have you seen the prospectus?—Yes; I have seen a prospectus in which George Cole appeared as the secretary, and Thomas Brown, the solicitor, of Mark-lane, told me he was connected with Mr. Cole when Mr. Cole was secretary to the Southend Railway.

15748. What sort of a scheme was that?—It was intended to be a continuation of the London and Blackwall.

15749. Do you know William Dorrington?—I have given evidence as to him in a former case, that was in the Westminster and Deptford.

15750. Do you know William Dorrington, of 9, Harleyford-street, Kennington?—I do.

15751. Do you know his handwriting?—No; I do not.

15752. Was he formerly clerk to Mr. Stewart, the stockbroker?—Yes; he was.

15753. What is he now?—I do not know.

15754. Has he been a share-hunter?—I do not know anything of his transactions.

15755. Do you know whether he received anything for signing the Deptford and Dover Company's deed?—Yes.

15756-74. How much?—Four shillings.

15775. Mr. *Vane.*] "William White, 56, Lime-street, City, gentleman"?—I could not find any such person, there is no such number as 56, in Lime-street. I found a Mr. White, at No. 10, and he said letters had been sent to him, which he had returned, not knowing the person.

15776. What is that Mr. White?—He appeared to be a merchant, a very respectable house, at No. 10.

15777. Did you make inquiries elsewhere?—Yes, I did.

15778. Were you enabled to find White?—No, I could not find him anywhere.

15779. Mr. *Bere.*] Did you ask the Mr. White you saw, whether he was a subscriber to the South Midland?—Yes; he said he knew nothing of the deed whatever.

15780. What parish is Lime-street in?—I do not know.

15781. Did you make any inquiry of the overseer?—No; I went to various numbers.

15782. Did you happen to go to any constable?—No.

15783. Or any parish officer in the district?—No; I asked of the postman.

15784. Which, the general or twopenny?—It was one with a red coat on.

Mr.

Mr. *Bere* stated that Mr. White had applied for 20 shares, and that they had been allotted to him.

Mr. *D. E. Stephens.*

9 May 1837.

15785. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you know Sweeting's-rents?—Yes.

15786. Where is it?—On the east side of the Royal Exchange?—Mr. Bere stated that William White had given two addresses in his letters, one being dated the 2d April 1836, Sweeting's-rents, Royal Exchange, applying for 30 shares, indorsed by the secretary of the company, 56, Lime-street; and another letter of the 21st March, to William Scriven, esq., applying for 20 shares.

A bankers' receipt for 20 *l.*, was produced, indorsed by William White, 56, Lime-street, City, and it appeared by the bankers' book that 20 *l.* were paid in that day.

15787. *Chairman* (to Mr. *Gustard.*)] Have you made any inquiries respecting William White?—Yes.

15788. What was the result?—The landlady told me he was a very respectable man, and a man of property.

15789. Where did you inquire?—53, Lime-street.

15790. 56, we had before?—It is a mistake, it is 53; she had known him for years, she said.

15791. Mr. *Vane.*] What caused you to go to 53, Lime-street?—This was one of the names in your petition.

15792. That is 56. How came you to go to 53?—I think that is the highest number, she told me at once it was Mr. White's, and she told me she had known him since he was a youth.

15793. Did you ask her his age?—No.

15794. Is it a lodging-house?—No, he does not live there; he has a sort of counting-house there.

15795. Did you ask what profession or calling he was?—He is a stock-broker, I believe.

15796. You believe?—She said so, that he dealt in shares and stock.

15797. Mr. *Vane*, to Mr. *Stephens.*] "William Pitfield, 190, High-street, Shadwell, gentleman, 60 shares, 3,000 *l.*"; did you go to 190, High-street, Shadwell?—Yes.

15798. Did you inquire there for Pitfield?—Yes.

15799. Of whom did you make inquiry?—Mr. Phinning, tobacconist, who lives in the house.

15800. What was his answer?—That he knew nothing whatever of Pitfield; that letters had been sent, addressed to him, which he had returned.

15801. Did you inquire elsewhere?—Yes; I inquired at No. 2, Shadwell, where Pitfield describes himself as living, when he signed the Deptford and Dover deed for 1,500 *l.*

15802. Could you learn anything of him there?—No; I also inquired of the collectors in the parish, and they did not know any of that name.

15803. Could you learn anything further about him?—No.

15804. Mr. *Bere.*] What collector did you inquire of?—Mr. Barnes, the parish collector.

15805. What parish?—Shadwell.

15806. What is 190, High-street?—It is a tobacconist's shop.

15807. Did you inquire whether they let lodgings?—Yes, I did; and they did not take in lodgers.

A letter returned through the twopenny post was put in, addressed William Pitfield, Esq., 190, High-street, Shadwell, indorsed "gone away and left no address." The bankers' receipt was produced for 60 *l.*, dated 28th March, and indorsed on the back 190, High-street, Shadwell; and on that day it appeared two sums of 60 *l.* were paid in, one by Mr. Ord, and the other by John Garland.

15808. Mr. *Vane.*] "William Hall, 8, Capel-court, Bank"?—Yes; I have got it.

15809. "Gentleman, 50 shares, 2,500 *l.*" Do you know him?—Yes, I do.

15810. What is he?—He deals largely in shares; to use his own words, "I deal largely in shares; I have signed the deed," speaking of the South Midland, "for others, but not for myself."

Mr. *D. E. Stephens.*

9 May 1837.

15811. Did he tell you he was the same person who has signed several deeds as residing at 83, London-road, Southwark?—He did.

15812. And Mount Nod Cottage, Streatham?—No, he did not name that.

15813. What deeds did he admit having signed, giving a residence 83, London-road?—South-western Railway, as of Capel-court, 17,250 *l.*, William Hall, London-road; Southwark, Kent, and Dover, 4,850 *l.*; the City Railway Deed, London-road, Southwark, 1,250 *l.*; the Direct London and Brighton, London-road, Southwark, 2,000 *l.*; the North and South Junction, as of the London-road, Southwark, and also of Capel-court, and each address for 5,000 *l.*

15814. Do you know anything of his circumstances?—No; I cannot say I do. I have known him personally some years.

15815. Is he a share-hunter?—I do not know.

15816. Does he deal in penny shares?—I do not know.

15817. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you know his handwriting?—No, I do not.

Mr. *Bere* produced a letter of application from William Hall, dated the 2d of April, from 8, Capel-court, addressed to Messrs. Perceval & Co. bankers, at Northampton, stating, "As a Northamptonshire man, born and brought up at Bramston, it is with much pleasure I find that my native town is likely to be improved by a railway conveyance, and in order to give a helping hand, I am anxious to subscribe for 200 shares, and I enclose a note for 200 *l.*," and that the note was enclosed.

Another letter was produced, dated April 30, 1836, addressed to the bankers, complaining of the want of an answer; that he is anxious to get back the 200 *l.*, and asking for an order upon their agents to that amount. A bankers' receipt, dated 28th March, for 50 *l.*, giving the address William Hall, 8, Capel-court, Bank, City, was produced.

[The Witness withdrew.

James Edwards, called in; and Examined, as follows:

James Edwards.

15818. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—17, Windsor-terrace, City-road.

15819. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Railway Company?—I did not.

15820. Have you signed the deed?—I have.

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

15821. Is that your name and handwriting?—Yes.

15822. Are those figures in your handwriting, "30, 1,500 *l.*"?—Yes.

15823. At whose instance did you sign that deed?—Mr. Charles Mann.

15824. Who is Mr. Mann?—He is a sharebroker.

15825. Where is his place of business?—Broad-street, No. 9.

15826. What are you?—I am a clerk.

15827. To Mr. Mann?—I was at that time.

15828. Are you aware whether Mr. Mann applied for shares in this company?—I believe he did, but I cannot say positively.

15829. What is your age?—I am 21.

15830. When were you 21?—In March last.

15831. *Chairman.*] In this year?—Yes.

15832. Mr. *Vane.*] When did you sign this deed?—I think it is about nine months ago, as well as I can recollect.

15833. At that time you were under the age of 21?—I was.

15834. Was Mr. Mann aware of that circumstance?—Yes, he was.

15835. Will you state to the Committee what passed between you and Mr. Mann upon the subject?—Mr. Mann asked me as a favour whether I would sign the deed; I hesitated for some time, and he said as I was under age it would not be of the slightest consequence.

15836. State what took place then?—I promised to do so, and did.

15837. Where did you go to sign the deed?—Somewhere up by the Strand, I forget where it was.

15838. Was it the office of the company?—Yes, it was.

15839. What

15839. What did Mr. Mann give you previously to going to sign the deed?—In money?

15840. Did he give you any money?—No.

15841. Did he give you any bankers' receipt?—Yes, he did.

15842. For 30 *l.* was it?—Yes.

15843. Is that the receipt you took (*handing a paper to the Witness*)?—It is.

15844. Is that your handwriting on the back?—Yes.

15845. State what took place when you attended at the company's office; who was present there?—That I cannot say.

15846. *Chairman.*] How many persons were present?—Perhaps as many as there are present now.

15847. Mr. *Vane.*] There were a good many in the room?—Yes; a great many.

15848. Did any conversation take place previous to your signing the deed?—I do not recollect anything.

15849. You must have asked them to allow you to sign the deed?—That I was asked in the outer room; I think I went into the inner room to sign the deed.

15850. State what passed in the inner room?—As near as I can recollect, there were some gentlemen there that were signing the deed that had not applied for shares; I think that was the case.

15851. With whom did that conversation pass?—I do not know; there were other persons in the room besides myself; I was directed to sign.

15852. After this conversation you were allowed to sign?—Yes.

15853. Did anything pass about your age?—Nothing at all.

15854. Was that deed read over to you or explained at the time of signing?—No; it was not.

15855. Were you aware that by signing the deed you were incurring a responsibility?—No; quite otherwise, being under age.

15856. After you had signed the deed and received the scrip from the secretary, what did you do with the scrip?—Gave it to Mr. Mann.

15857. Did he promise to give you anything for going up to sign the deed?—Nothing at all.

15858. *Chairman.*] Did he give you anything?—No.

15859. Mr. *Vane.*] Did he pay you any coach-hire or anything of that sort?—I think he did, but I am not sure; it is nine months ago.

15860. *Chairman.*] When you go from Broad-street to Charing-cross under ordinary circumstances, does Mr. Mann pay your coach-hire?—Yes; I was his clerk, and always, when going to the west-end, I used to charge coach-hire.

15861. Mr. *Vane.*] Had you any interest whatever in the shares for which you signed the deed?—None whatever.

15862. Have you ever signed any other deed?—Yes, I have.

15863. How many?—Perhaps two, or three, or four.

15864. *Chairman.*] Was this the first one you signed, or had you signed any other before?—I think this was the first.

15865. *Mr. Vane.*] Have you signed the South Western deed for 1,500 *l.*?—I think I have.

15866. Will you state to this Committee the reason you did not obey the two first summonses served upon you?—I did not understand the wording of the first.

15867. Have you got it with you?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

15868. How long have you left Mr. Mann?—About seven months.

15869. What was the occasion of your leaving?—Partly falling off in business.

15870. Had you been with him long?—No; a short time.

15871. Is he a stockbroker of respectability?—I should say he was.

15872. And of property?—That I cannot say.

15873. Do you know?—No.

15874. Is he a man received on the Stock Exchange as a man of property?—As a most respectable man.

15875. Respectability imports property in the city?—Yes.

15876. You say some discussion took place in the office, as to signing the deed?—Yes.

James Edwards.

9 May 1837.

15877. Did any person object to your signing the deed?—I believe I attended two or three days.

15878. When you went the first time, what was the reason you were not allowed to sign the deed?—Because there were so many persons before me.

15879. Was it upon the first occasion you heard the discussion about persons having a right to sign, having the bankers' receipts?—I heard it upon that occasion.

15880. Did some directors of the company object to it?—Yes.

15881. To persons holding the receipts coming to sign?—Yes.

15882. There was a large body of them?—Yes.

15883. When you came the second time why did you not sign?—For the same reason.

15884. The third time you signed?—Yes.

15885. At that time there were a good many persons present?—Yes.

15886. Signing at the same time?—Yes.

15887. When you say you have signed other railways, have they been for Mr. Mann?—Yes.

15888. Do you know to what amount?—No, I have no idea at all.

The letter of application from Mr. Mann, 7, Old Broad-street, but without date, was read for 50 shares; and another letter, dated 11th April 1836, inquiring why no notice was taken of his former letter.

Mr. *Bere* stated that no shares were allotted. The bankers' receipt for 30 *l.* was produced.

15889. Mr. *Bere.*] Was Mr. Mann with you at the time?—No, he was not.

15890. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you receive anything for signing the other deeds?—No.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Henry Allanson.*

Mr. *Henry Allanson*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

15891. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—31, Castle-street, Holborn.

15892. What are you?—In the silver and plated line.

15893. Are you a clerk in the shop of your father?—Not exactly.

15894. An assistant?—Yes.

15895. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Company?—I believe I did, but I cannot be exactly certain about it, but I never had any sent me.

Mr. *Bere* stated the witness had applied, and was refused.

15896. Have you signed the deed for 20 shares, 1,000 *l.*?—I am not exactly certain I signed it; I signed for one or two companies. I can tell if I see my handwriting.

15897. Did you pay a deposit on those shares?—No.

15898. From whom did you obtain the bankers' receipt for the deposit?—I purchased the bankers' receipt at the Stock Exchange.

15899. Of whom did you purchase it?—I never took particular account of whom I purchased them; I cannot exactly say; I could tell if I was at home. [*The deed was shown to the Witness.*] That is my handwriting.

15900. You do not know of whom you purchased the receipt?—No, I cannot tell.

15901. *Chairman.*] Did you pay the money for it?—Yes, when I purchased the receipt.

15902. Who gave you the money for it?—I found the money myself.

15903. Mr. *Vane.*] What salary do you receive from your father?—I do not receive any salary at all particularly; I am not at any stated salary.

15904. Have you signed the London, Shoreham, and Brighton Railway for 1,000 *l.*?—Not that I am aware of; I believe I have only signed for one other company.

15905. Mr. *Bere.*] Which is that?—The South Western I have signed for.

15906. Mr. *Vane.*] For 5,000 *l.*?—I cannot tell the exact amount.

15907. Have you signed Gibbs's Brighton Line for 3,600 *l.*?—I might have signed Gibbs's Line.

15908. *Chairman.*]

15908. *Chairman.*] Is your father alive?—Yes.

15909. Does he know you deal in these shares?—He knows I have dealt in them.

15910. Mr. *Vane.*] Is that Henry Allanson [*handing the printed list to the Witness*]?—That is my name, but it is not my handwriting.

Mr. *Vane.*] I know that, it is in print.

15911. *Chairman.*] Did you tell your father, before you bought these shares in the South Midland, you intended to do so?—He knew nothing of the shares I intended to purchase; he knew I was speculating in shares.

15912. Mr. *Vane.*] Do I understand you that this name here for 1,000 *l.* in the London, Shoreham and Brighton Railway, is your name, as printed by the authority of the House?—Is this Gibbs's Line?

15913. No, there is another.—I do not recollect signing for this at all.

15914. Do you know of any other Henry Allanson, of 31, Castle-street, Holborn?—I have got two or three brothers, but not of the name of Henry.

15915. Is that your name, Henry Allanson, 31, Castle-street, Holborn [*handing another printed list to the Witness*]?—Yes, that is my name, certainly.

15916. Did you sign the deed in that company?—I cannot say, without seeing my signature.

15917. *Chairman.*] Do you remember signing the South Western?—I recollect signing two or three in which I held shares; but I cannot say without seeing my name.

15918. Mr. *Vane.*] You signed several?—I signed two or three.

15919. *Chairman.*] You keep no account of what shares you hold?—No.

15920. Do you still hold the shares in the South Midland?—I cannot exactly tell what I hold, I can tell by looking over them; I hold some of them.

15921. Mr. *Vane.*] You say you signed the South Western?—Yes, I did; but I cannot tell whether that is my name; they may print anything they please. I cannot say till I see the deed.

15922. Is there any other person named Henry Allanson, who resides at 31, Castle-street, Holborn, who describes himself as a silversmith?—Not that I ever heard of.

15923. *Chairman.*] Did you ever hear of any other person besides yourself named Henry Allanson, silversmith, of Castle-street, Holborn?—No, I never heard of any other.

15924. Mr. *Vane.*] The sum for which Henry Allanson of 31, Castle-street, Holborn, has subscribed in those three lists I have shown to you, amounts to 10,600 *l.*; should you be enabled to pay that sum, as it may be called for by instalments?—I do not know whether I signed for any such sum; I believe I signed for 1,000 *l.* in the South Midland.

15925. You believe it; do you not know it?—Yes, that is my writing; I signed for it.

15926. Shall you be able to pay that 1,000 *l.*, as it should be called for by instalments?—I could have done it when I signed for it.

15927. Can you do it now?—No; perhaps not.

15928. Are you able to pay the next call of 10 *s.* per share, that will be made upon those shares?—Yes; I suppose I can.

15929. Can you pay it or can you not?—I can pay 10 *s.* a share.

15930. That will be 10 *l.*?—Yes, I can.

15931. You receive no stated salary from your father?—No.

15932. What does your general income amount to?—I cannot tell.

15933. *Chairman.*] What did you receive last year?—I did not attend to business last year.

15934. Or the year before?—I have never attended to business strictly last year or the year before.

15935. Mr. *Vane.*] Of what calling have you been?—I have always lived with my father; I never attended to business as I ought to have done. I have never received any fixed salary.

15936. Were you a dealer in shares?—I used to deal in shares.

15937. *Chairman.*] What has been your occupation during the last two or three years?—I have attended to my father's business.

 15938. What

Mr. *Henry Allanson.*

9 May 1837.

15938. What did your father pay you?—I have received no remuneration for it.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

15939. Are you living with your father now?—Yes.

15940. Does your father carry on an extensive business?—Yes, he does.

15941. In the Sheffield plate?—Yes.

15942. Have you connections at Sheffield?—Yes.

15943. An uncle?—Yes.

15944. What relation is the firm of Allanson & Machin?—My father's name is Allanson, he is a partner there.

15945. He carries it on in Sheffield as well as in London?—Yes.

15946. Are you and your brothers going to succeed your father in the trade?—I cannot say what my brother may do.

15947. Will you yourself succeed your father in the trade?—I suppose I shall.

15948. You were asked whether you could pay 10*l.*; could you pay three or four 10*l.* if called for?—I could not tell what I should be able to pay if I was compelled.

15949. Could you pay 20*l.*?—Yes.

15950. What did you give for this receipt in the market?—I cannot say; I bought some at a discount and some at a premium.

15951. Can you tell whether you bought those at a premium or discount?—No, I could not tell; I should think it was at a premium.

15952. You say you cannot recollect from whom you bought it; can you tell me whether you bought it of a person of the name of Peach?—No; I bought some South Midland of a person of the name of Morrison.

15953. What Morrison is it?—I believe he used to live——

15954. Do you mean the banker?—No; he used to live somewhere at the bottom of Exmouth-street.

15955. You applied for shares in it, and they were allotted to you?—Yes.

15956. Is that your handwriting (*showing a letter to the Witness*)?—Yes.

15957. In your letter you refer for your respectability to Allanson & Machin, at Sheffield?—Yes.

15958. Mr. *Vane.*] Is the whole of that letter in your handwriting?—Yes.

15959. Mr. *Bere.*] Do you recollect enclosing a card in the letter?—No; I do not believe that is my handwriting which is in the corner.

15960. (To Mr. *Gustard.*) That is your handwriting?—Yes.

15961. Being a copy of the card inclosed?—Yes, it is.

15962. (To Mr. *Allanson.*) Is that a copy of the Sheffield card?—Yes, I think it is.

Mr. *Bere* produced the bankers' receipt, marked with the initials J. W. P., and by the bankers' book, 20*l.* was received that day; the letter appeared to be dated the 24th of March 1836.

Re-examined by Mr. *Vane.*

15963. You say you suppose you shall succeed to your father's trade; what right have you to suppose that?—I do not know; I am in the business now.

15964. *Chairman.*] Are you a partner now?—No, but I shall be soon.

15965. Mr. *Vane.*] When?—When he chooses to take me.

15966. You say you dare say you can pay 20*l.*; from what source should you obtain that 20*l.*?—Perhaps I have got it now.

15967. Have you got it now?—Yes, I could pay 20*l.*

15968. You say you think you bought the shares of Mr. Morrison?—Yes, I think I did.

15969. Do you believe that what is written in the corner of the letter is a copy of your father's card?—I am not certain whether I ever put the card in.

15970. Had you any authority from your father to enclose the card?—I do not know that I did enclose it.

15971. *Chairman.*] If you did enclose a card to the company, had you any authority from your father to do it?—No, I had no authority to do it.

15972. Mr. *Vane.*] Have you a card of your own?—I could send one. *Henry Alianson.*

15973. Have you a card of your own?—I have got a private card of my own; I have not brought it with me. 9 May 1837.

[The Witness withdrew.

Benjamin Day, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

15974. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—No. 6, Jewin-street, Aldersgate. *Benjamin Day.*

15975. What are you?—I am a jobber in shares.

15976. Did you apply for shares in the South Midland Counties Railway Company?—Yes, I did.

15977. Had you any shares allotted to you?—Yes, I had.

15978. How many?—30.

15979. Did you sign the deed?—Yes, I did.

15980. Did you pay the deposit upon those shares?—Yes, I did.

15981. Was it with your own money you paid those deposits?—Yes, it was.

15982. Have you signed any other deeds besides the South Midland Counties Railway?—Yes.

15983. Do you recollect what deeds?—Am I obliged to answer that.

15984. *Chairman.*] Yes?—There is the Westminster and Deptford.

15985. Mr. *Vane.*] How much money; was it 2,500*l.*?—Yes, I think it was.

15986. The London, Shoreham and Brighton, 200*l.*?—Yes.

15987. The South Western for 5,000*l.*?—Yes, 100 shares.

15988. Gibbs's London and Brighton for 900*l.*?—Yes.

15989. The Dublin and Kilkenny for 1,000*l.*?—Yes.

15990. The whole of these amount to 11,100*l.*?—Yes.

15991. Are you capable of paying that sum by instalments as they become due?—I cannot say what situation I shall be in when they come due.

15992. *Chairman.*] Could you pay 5 per cent. upon the amount in the next month?—No, I should not say I could.

15993. Mr. *Vane.*] Could you pay the 1,500*l.*, for which you have subscribed in this company, by instalments?—I do not know; I might be able, perhaps, to pay up the instalments as they are called for.

15994. Could you if the shares remain in the same state as they are at present?—I may be able to pay up the calls; I have paid up calls upon other shares, and I might be able upon these.

15995. In what way have you been able?—I have had the money.

15996. Have you borrowed it upon those shares?—No, my own money.

15997. Have you the money now to enable you to do it?—I dare say I could pay up 30 shares if I were called on.

15998. You dare say you could?—I could do it.

15999. Do you not deal in these penny shares?—These things are all sometimes sold at a penny and sometimes at 5*l.* premium.

16000. Have you dealt in penny shares?—Yes; I have bought shares at a penny and sold them at 5*l.* premium.

16001. Do you call that making a good bargain?—Yes, very good; that is only now and then.

16002. You are a jobber on the Exchange?—Yes.

16003. Have you any other business besides that?—No.

16004. Have you ever had?—Yes, I kept a tobacconist's shop in Sweeting's-alley.

16005. Do you job in shares?—Yes, and speculate in the funds in consols.

16006. Have you ever been a defaulter upon the Exchange?—No, never.

16007. What was the reason of your leaving the tobacconist's shop?—It did not answer.

16008. Not pecuniary embarrassment?—No, I paid every one.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

16009. Will you tell me what penny shares are; are they letters of appropriation?—Yes.

16010. Which you buy and sell again?—Yes. When the day draws near for the payment, persons very often sell them because they do not choose to pay them up, and they have been done as low as a penny.

16011. What you call penny shares are letters of appropriation, before any of the money is paid up?—Yes.

Benjamin Day.

9 May 1837.

16012. And having these letters will enable you to go to the bankers' and pay the deposits?—Yes.

16013. Had you shares appropriated to you to the extent of 30?—Yes, I had more; I think I paid up 100.

16014. In the South Midland?—Yes, I had about 80. I had two different letters of appropriation. I sent to Northampton.

16015. Did you pay the deposits upon them both?—Yes.

16016. Did you apply the 2d of April for some more shares [*handing a letter to the Witness*]?—Yes; that is mine.

16017. It was declined?—Yes; I had no answer.

16018. That was for 30 shares; and you say you have paid upon 50 shares, 40 *l.* to Perceval and 10 *l.* to Esdailes, and you wished for 30 more, which was declined?—Yes.

16019. Are you the same person that signed himself Benjamin Day, Monkwell-street, Falcon-square?—Yes, I lived there at that time.

16020. Do you consider yourself as good for 15,000 *l.*?—No; I did not say so.

16021. Somebody else may have said so; did anybody say you were good for 15,000 *l.*?—No.

16022. £.1,500?—I said I could pay the instalments as they were called for.

16023. Do you consider yourself as good for 1,500 *l.*?—I am not worth 1,500 *l.*

[The Witness withdrew.

Otto Penn, called in; and Examined, as follows:

Otto Penn.

16024. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—Stratford.

16025. In Essex?—Yes.

16026. What are you?—I was formerly a jobber, but now I am managing a relation's business.

16027. Do you know Robert Brine, who did reside at 4, Camden-hill Villas, Kensington?—I do not.

A returned twopenny-post letter was put in, directed to 4, Camden-hill Villas, and altered to Mr. Ladd's, 6, Great Union-street, and marked "gone away from the second address, and not known where."

Another letter was put in, addressed R. Brine, Esq., 4, Camden-hill Villas, and altered to Great Union-street, Borough, and marked "gone away from the second address."

16028. Do you know William Bamfield, Sweeting's-alley, bootmaker?—Yes, I do.

16029. Is he a jobber on 'Change?—He is in the habit of jobbing in shares.

16030. In penny shares?—I cannot say exactly in penny shares, but small shares.

16031. Do you know his handwriting?—I do not.

16032. He is a young man?—About 30 years of age.

16033. Do you know whether he is a responsible person for 2,000 *l.*?—I should think not; I should certainly say he was not able to pay 2,000 *l.*

16034. Should you say he was able to pay 1,000 *l.*?—I should think not.

16035. Is he able to pay the call of 10 *s.* a share on 40 shares?—He is.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

16036. Should you say that Mr. Bamfield cannot pay 1,000 *l.*?—From the nature of his business I should say not.

16037. Have you ever been in his shop?—Some hundreds of times.

16038. If any person has been here and says he is able to pay a large sum of money, he is mistaken; you do not agree with him?—No; he is respectable in his business.

16039. Has he lived there some years?—Yes.

16040. Do you know his private property?—No, I do not.

16041. Did you ever inquire of him whether he had any private property?—No.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Winkworth*, called in; and further Examined, as follows:

16042. Mr. *Vane.*] DID you inquire at 7, Sweeting's-alley, for William Bamfield?—No.

16043. Did you ask him if he had signed the South Midland Counties deed?—I did.

16044. Did he tell you for what sum?—No.

16045. Did you tell him for what sum?—I told him he had signed it for 40 shares.

16046. What did he say to you?—He told me he had disposed of the shares.

16047. Did he say anything about his responsibility?—I asked if he knew the responsibility he had incurred, he said he did not care a pinch of snuff; he said if he was called upon he must go to prison, for he could not pay it.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

16048. Did you name any sum when he said he must go to prison?—£.2,000.

16049. When he said he must go to prison, was it when you said he was liable for 2,000 *l.*?—Yes; if he was liable to pay it he must go to prison.

16050. Did you happen to tell him he would not be liable, except upon the instalments?—No, I did not.

16051. Mr. *Vane.*] Did you make inquiry at 2, Queen-street, Islington, for James Railton?—I did.

16052. Who did you see there?—I saw an old person, Mrs. Railton.

16053. Did she tell you she was the mother of James Railton?—Yes; and told me where to apply for him.

16054. Did you tell her that James Railton had signed the South Midland Railway deed for 2,000 *l.*?—I did not; I asked her if he had signed the deed, and she said she supposed he had shares, but if I would go to 56, Threadneedle-street, he would tell me.

16055. Did you go to him?—Yes, and he told me he held his shares.

16056. What is he?—A clerk to a person of the name of Shaw.

16057. Did he tell you he could not fulfil those engagements for calls?—No.

16058. *Chairman.*] What did he tell you?—He merely told me that he held his shares, and that he signed the deed.

16059. Mr. *Bere.*] Did he tell you he was able to pay?—No.

16060. Did you ask him?—No.

16061. How comes it that some of these people you ask if they were able to fulfil their engagements, and others not?—Sometimes they were respectable.

16062. When they were respectable, you did not ask the question?—I did not ask him at all events.

A bankers' receipt was put in in the case of Railton for 50 *l.*; also the application for 10 shares, and 10 shares allotted; and by the banker's book 50 *l.* appeared to have been paid in by Railton the 25th March, and the deed was executed the 25th of April.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Vane* stated, that with the exception of Fraser and Head, he had closed his evidence, and with the permission of the Committee he would call them at the sitting of the Committee on its next meeting.

The further consideration of the South Midland case was postponed to Thursday, the 18th of May.

[For Evidence, Questions 16063 to 16573, *see* Fifth Report, p. 1 to 19; Q. 16574 to 16609, *see* Third Report, p. 138, 139; Q. 16610 to 18757, *see* Fifth Report, p. 19 to 88.]

Jovis, 18° *die Maii*, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., in the Chair.

Mr. *Walter George Head*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *W. G. Head.*

18 May 1837.

18758. Mr. *Vane.*] WHERE do you reside?—36, Percy-street, Bedford-square.

18759. Do you know Robert Brine?—Yes.

18760. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes, I think so: I have an acceptance of his in my pocket.

18761. Do you know his handwriting?—Yes, I think I do.

18762. Mr. *Bere.*] Have you any other means of knowing his handwriting, except from having his acceptance?—I have seen him write; I have seen him write that acceptance for one thing; and I have seen him write notes.—[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]—That I should take to be his handwriting; I believe it thoroughly to be his handwriting.

18763. Do you know Brine?—Yes, perfectly well.

18764. Did Brine reside at Camden-hill Villas either in the month of April, May or June last?—I do not think he did.

18765. What reason have you for thinking he did not?—Because I went to him for money shortly after Christmas; and after having gone a very few times, which I should think did not occupy a month, he was gone from there.

18766. Does he owe you anything?—About 23*l.* he owes me.

18767. For what does he owe you that sum?—For rent.

18768. Was he a lodger in your house?—He lodged with me three months or a little more.

18769. Have you made many applications for that money?—Yes, I have been many times; I have seen him perhaps four or five.

18770. What did he tell you?—That he would pay me as soon as he could.

18771. Did he tell you he had a wife and family, and had been out of employment some time?—Yes; I knew that.

18772. He has subscribed the South Midland Counties Railway deed for 7,500*l.*; there will be a call of 10*s.* a share on 150 shares on the 1st of June next: do you believe him to be capable of paying that money?—Not according to his own words; he always declared the utmost poverty, and acted like it while in my house, and were obliged to borrow everything; not everything, that is wrong; but plates, and knives and forks, and bed and bedstead, &c. &c., some of which they took away with them.

18773. Do you know where he is residing now?—No.

18774. Have you tried to find him out?—Yes, lately.

18775. You have tried?—Yes; I met him last time at Kennington; he refused to give me his address, and I told him the good opinion I had of him was gone; he had seen nothing in me, in my nature, to make him afraid to give to me his address.

18776. Did you make any inquiry lately at Camden-hill Villas about Brine?—The last time I was there I saw a carpenter working in the fore-garden, and he told me he belonged to the landlord.

Mr. *Bere* objected to the evidence.

The evidence was waived.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

18777. When did you last make any search for Mr. Brine?—Never since I met him.

18778. When

Mr. *W. G. Head.*

18 May 1837.

18778. When was that?—Last summer.

18779. 1836?—Yes.

18780. You say you know his handwriting: is that his handwriting [*handing a paper to the Witness*]?—Yes, I should think it is.

18781. And this also [*handing another paper*]?—Yes, I should say so.

18782. Is that his handwriting too [*handing a note to the Witness*]?—That I do not know; there is the signature of an initial more than I have ever seen.

18783. Look at the body of it?—It is like it.

18784. What was he before you had the dispute about the rent; you say he had forfeited your good opinion?—When I first knew him he said he was secretary to a water company.

18785. What water company?—A spring water company, in Trafalgar-square.

18786. When did you first know him?—In June 1835.

18787. He began to lodge with you then?—Yes.

18788. Lodged with you, how long?—Till the September quarter.

18789. Had you known him during any other period of his life before that?—Never.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Bere* produced the application for 50 shares by Robert Brine, dated the 31st of March 1836, and stated that none were allotted; and also three bankers' receipts; one, the 30th of March 1836, 60*l.*; another, the 28th day of March, 60*l.*; and the other, the 29th of March, for 30*l.*; each of them being indorsed by R. Brine.

8790. Mr. *Bere*, to Mr. *Gustard.*] Did Mr. Brine apply at the office to sign for 50 shares more?—Yes.

18791. Did he pay the deposit for them?—He had bought them in the market.

18792. Did you decline to let him sign?—Yes.

18793. In consequence of that, did you return him the amount of the deposit?—Yes, 50*l.*

18794. Do you recollect when it was?—About two or three weeks after he had signed the deed.

18795. You took a receipt for 50*l.* on the back of the bankers' cheque?—Yes.

18796. (To Mr. *Head.*) Is that his handwriting?—Yes.

18797. Mr. *Vane*, (to Mr. *Gustard.*)] What was your reason for not letting him sign for the 50 shares?—Because he had signed before.

18798. For 150 shares?—Yes.

18799. That was your reason for not letting him sign for the 50?—Yes.

18800. How came you not to let him sign twice, as you had let others sign?—Because the name was in the receipt; and I told him he had better get Mr. Cater to sign; he came and said, Mr. Cater would not come; and I told him the directors would not let him sign.

[The Witness withdrew.

Richard Spencer, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Richard Spencer.

18801. Mr. *Vane.*] HAVE you seen Charles Fraser, of 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road, in the last day or two?—Yes, I have.

18802. When and where?—I saw him the day before yesterday on the Royal Exchange; and yesterday I saw him twice near the Royal Exchange, under the piazzas.

18803. Had you any conversation with him?—I had.

18804. State the substance of it?—I stated that summonses had been given for him, and it was strange he did not appear at the House; he said his business was of such a nature, he could not possibly come.

18805. Did you see him have the summons, or any other paper, in his hands?—Yes, he showed me the summons he had had from the House.

[The Witness withdrew.

18 May 1837.

Mr. *Vere* produced a bankers' receipt, dated 25th of March 1836, for 20*l.*, indorsed "Charles Fraser, Cornhill, 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road."

Mr. *Bere* also stated, that Charles Fraser applied for 20 shares, which were allotted, and that the deposits had been paid in his own name.

Mr. *Vane* was heard to comment upon the evidence which had been adduced in support of the Petitions.

Mr. *Frederick Vane*, was again called in; and further Examined, as follows:

Mr. *F. Vane.*

18806. Mr. *Vane.*] Look at that table [*handing a paper to the Witness*]; were the names which are included in that table found by you in the evidence which has been given, or rather taken, before this Committee?—Yes.

18807. Did you find the name of Henry Allanson in this evidence?—Yes, I did.

18808. Did you find he had admitted his having subscribed the South Midland deed for 1,000 *l.*?—Yes.

18809. And the South Western deed for 5,000 *l.*?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Bere.*

18810. Just turn to the name of William Cooke; you have put him down as having subscribed Gibbs's London and Brighton Line for 200 *l.*?—Yes.

18811. Where did you get the description of William Cooke, by which you identified the William Cooke of the South Midland with the William Cooke of Rennie's Line, the one being described as of 8, Capel-court, Bank, and the other as of Houndsditch?—He owns to having subscribed for such a sum, 19,650 *l.*, in answer to the question 14364.

18812. You say you derive your information from 14364?—Yes.

18813. Show me the acknowledgment of that; read the passage you consider the acknowledgment of that?—The question is by Mr. Vane: "Are you aware that you are responsible for 19,650 *l.* in different railways?"

18814. What is his answer?—"Those railways have no Acts of Parliament; and many of the prospectuses tell the shareholders they are not liable beyond their deposits."

18815. Is it from that you infer he is liable to that amount?—Yes.

18816. Have you any other evidence but that upon which you have charged him with being the same person?—Yes; I suppose that he was aware of it, or he would not have confessed to having signed to that amount.

18817. Where does he confess it?—He does not deny it.

18818. Is that the way you made up that table?—I took that as an admission that he has signed to that amount.

18819. "William Hamilton;" you have represented him to have signed the City deed for 4,000 *l.*?—Yes.

18820. How do you identify the William Hamilton of the South Midland with the William Hamilton who signed that deed?—He confesses having signed deeds to that amount.

18821. Show me his confession?—In answer to question 9896.

18822. I want to know by what means you identify this gentleman, Mr. Hamilton; have you any better ground for it than you had for Cooke?—I consider it quite sufficient, when Cooke admits he signed for that amount.

18823. Have you any other ground in the case of Mr. Hamilton?—In answer to question 9892; and here is another, 15566.

18824. "William Hall;" you have stated him to be a subscriber to London, Shoreham and Brighton for 4,000 *l.*; how do you identify the William Hall of 8, Capel-court, with the William Hall of 83, London-road, Southwark?—[*The Witness read an extract from the former Evidence, being the answers to the following questions*, 10799, 10800, 10801, 15808, *et seq.*]

18825. Now "John Morgan," for the London, Shoreham and Brighton; you say he signed for 500 *l.*; did John Morgan sign there for himself, or by the authority of Mr. Stephenson, for that amount?—[*The Witness read a passage from the printed Evidence, commencing at question* 13247.]

18826. Is

18826. Is it from that you infer it is the same person; have you any other evidence?—If you go on to the next question, he owns to the amount altogether, therefore I consider that sufficient.

18827. Are there many of these companies you have named here that have obtained their Bills?—I believe not.

18828. None of them?—I will not be sure.

18829. The Bristol and Exeter?—I believe that has.

18830. Do you know whether the Thames Haven have got their Bill?—I do not know.

18831. The Birmingham and Gloucester; that has obtained its Bill, has it not?—I am not aware.

[The Witness withdrew.

[*The following Paper was delivered in:*]

COURTEENHALL AND GREAT WIGSTON (OR

SCHEDULE of the NAMES of the DIRECTORS and SUBSCRIBERS who appear in other RAILWAY SUBSCRIPTION LISTS,

	South Midland Counties.	City and Richmond.	Westminster Bridge and Deptford.	London, Shoreham and Brighton.	South Western.	Kent, or Deptford and Dover.	Eastern Counties.	Thames Haven.	London and Blackwall.	Chester Junction.	London and Dover.	Great North of England.	London and Falmouth.	London and Brighton (Gibbs).
Proposed Capital of the Company - -	£. 1,200,000	£. 850,490	£. 665,000	£. 996,053	£. 1,650,000	£. 3,000,000	£. 1,600,000	£. 450,000	£. 299,000	£. 371,000	£. 1,400,000	£. 450,995	£. 1,700,000	£ 950,000
Allanson, Henry -	1,000	–	–	–	5,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3,600
Beckers Gustavus, Edward.	2,500	3,000	–	–	5,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1,250	–
Blackmore, R. - -	3,500	1,750	1,000	–	–	2,000	–	2,000	–	–	–	–	–	1,100 800
Bloxam, William -	7,000	1,750 750	–	500	4,750	–	–	–	–	1,000	–	–	–	400 400
Broad, George A. -	6,000	–	–	–	–	500	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cooke, William -	1,500	1,000 3,000	–	600	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	200
Dorrington, William -	11,000	3,000	2,500 500	1,000	4,500	2,500	–	2,500	–	–	–	–	–	400
Dandridge, Joseph -	1,500	4,000 2,750	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Day, Benjamin -	1,500	–	2,500	200	1,000 4,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	900
Edwards, James -	1,500	–	–	–	2,500	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Fisher, Hugh Evans -	1,000	–	–	–	1,750 3,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Fraser, Charles - -	1,000	1,000 500	500 1,500	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1,750 625	–
Gompertz, Alexander -	2,000	–	–	–	2,000	–	–	2,500	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hamilton, William -	5,000	4,000	–	1,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hall, William - -	2,500	1,250	–	4,000	17,250	4,850 2,750 300	–	–	–	–	–	–	1,250	2,200 450 200 200
Haley, John - -	1,000	–	1,500	–	1,500	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jones, Stopford - -	5,000	–	–	–	5,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jackson, John - -	15,500	5,000	500 2,500	1,500	5,000	–	–	–	–	–	9,750	–	500	400
Kerr, Archibald -	2,750	2,500	–	–	5,000 1,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Morgan, John - -	1,500	500 1,000	750	500	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	500	200
Piercy, William Algernon.	1,500	2,250 250	250 750	1,000	1,500 3,500 500	500	2,750	–	500	750	–	–	–	1,200
Prankerd, Vernon -	1,000	–	1,500	–	1,500	250	–	2,000	–	–	–	–	–	510
Rickards, Richard -	2,000	–	1,500	3,000	2,500	–	–	–	–	–	–	5,000	–	400
Spencer, Richard -	750	–	1,500	–	–	9,500	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sanders, George -	6,500	–	–	–	5,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1,000
Spear, John - -	1,000	–	–	–	3,250	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Stokes, John Edward -	4,000	4,000	750	–	5,000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3,100

SOUTH MIDLAND COUNTIES) RAILWAY.

showing the Sums Subscribed in each Company, and the Aggregate Amount of their Subscriptions.

London and Brighton (Remnie).	London and Exeter.	Cheltenham Union.	Dublin and Kilkenny.	Bristol and Exeter.	South Durham.	Manchester South Union.	South Eastern, Newhaven.	Clarence and Hartlepool.	Birmingham and Gloucester.	Edinburgh and Glasgow.	Birmingham and Derby Junction.	Portsmouth Junction.	Chester and Crewe.	London Grand Junction.	Gravesend and Strood.	South Durham.	TOTAL.
£. 1,200,000	£. 950,000	£. 1,400,000	£. 783,400	£. —	£. 155,000	£. 2,000,000	£. 1,200,000	£. 40,000	£. —	£. 893,000	£. 360,000	£. 300,000	£. 240,000	£. —	£. —	£. —	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10,600
—	1,250	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13,000
750	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12,900
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	500	—	—	—	17,050
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6,500
7,500	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	19,950
6,150																	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	27,900
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8,250
—	—	—	1,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11,100
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,000
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5,750
—	1,750	—	1,000	2,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		12,250
	625																
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	750	11,250
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10,000
16,125	1,250	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	54,525
750	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5,125
375																	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10,000
1,500	500	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,000	—	—	44,650
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11,250
—	500	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5,450
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	500 (as "V. Gerald.")	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17,700
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6,790
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14,000
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11,750
750	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13,250
—	—	—	—	2,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,250
																	19,150

Mr. *Bere* was heard on behalf of the South Midland Company, to observe upon the Evidence which had been adduced by the Petitioners.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

No. 1.—Petition of Richard Spencer and John Spear, 20 March 1837 - - - - p. 117

No. 2.—Petition of Sir Henry Halford, Bart., 20 March 1837 - - - - - p. 117

No. 3.—Parliamentary Contract - - - - - - - - - - p. 120

No. 4.—Subscribers' Agreement - - - - - - - - - - p. 121

No. 5.—List of Subscribers - - - - - - - - - - - p. 122

No. 6.—A List of Persons to whom Shares have been allotted, and the Number of Shares allotted to each - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 133

No. 7.—Returns to the Order of the Committee, of 5 May 1837 - - - - - p. 139

APPENDIX.

SOUTH MIDLAND COUNTIES RAILWAY.

Appendix, No. 1.

PETITION of *Richard Spencer* and *John Spear*.—20 March 1837.

No. 1.
Petition of R. Spencer and J. Spear.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of us, the undersigned *Richard Spencer*, of No. 27, Baldwin-street, City-road, Labourer, and *John Spear*, of Clerkenwell-green, Merchants' Clerk, both in the county of Middlesex,

Sheweth,

That a Bill has been introduced into your Honourable House for making a railway from the London and Birmingham Railway, in the parish of Courteenhall, in the county of Northampton, to the Midland Counties Railway, in the parish of Great Wigston, in the county of Leicester, and passing through or near the towns of Northampton and Market Harborough, to be called "The South Midland Counties Railway."

That your Petitioners were induced, from pecuniary and other circumstances, to sign and subscribe the Parliamentary Contracts or Subscription Lists for the said Company for the number of shares and for the amounts in money set opposite to their respective names therein, although they have not paid the deposits due thereon.

That your Petitioners have signed the Parliamentary Deeds, or Subscription Lists, in other companies to the amount of many thousand pounds, and received various pecuniary considerations for so doing.

That your Petitioner, *Richard Spencer*, is not and has never been a surveyor; and that he and your other Petitioner have described themselves differently in the various deeds signed by them, without being aware of the serious responsibility they have incurred.

That your Petitioners were then and still are in an indigent state, and would (if called upon) be totally unable to fulfil the contracts entered into by them.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will refer this Petition to a Select Committee of your Honourable House, to inquire into the allegations contained herein, that your Petitioners may prove the fraud committed on the Legislature, the *bonâ fide* shareholders of the said Company and the public in general, and that such relief in the premises may be afforded to your Petitioners as to your Honourable House shall seem meet,

And your Petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 2.

PETITION of Sir *Henry Halford*, Bart.—20 March 1837.

No. 2.
Petition of Sir H. Halford, Bart.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of me, the undersigned *Henry Halford*, of Wistow Hall in the county of Leicester, Bart.,

Sheweth,

That a Bill has been introduced into your Honourable House for making a railway from the London and Birmingham Railway, in the parish of Courteenhall, in the county of Northampton, to the Midland Counties Railway, in the parish of Great Wigston, in the county of Leicester, and passing through or near the towns of Northampton and Market Harborough, to be called "The South Midland Counties Railway."

No. 2.
Petition of Sir H. Halford, Bart.

That your Petitioner is the owner and occupier of the mansion-house called Wistow House, and also the owner of the mansion-house called Newton Harcourt, and that it appears by the said Bill, and from the map or plan deposited in the Private Bill Office of your Honourable House, that the said railway is proposed to be carried close upon the said mansions, and for the distance of nearly a mile-and-a-half through the estate of your Petitioner, with considerable cuttings and embankments, and that the same will, if carried into execution in the manner contemplated by the said Bill, most materially injure and deteriorate his property.

That during the last session of Parliament an Act was passed for making a line of railway called the Midland Counties Railway, being a parallel line with and having the same *termini* as the proposed South Midland Counties line; and your Petitioner therefore conceives that the said proposed line is altogether unnecessary, and that it is wholly uncalled for by the wants of the public, and would not produce any public advantage adequate to the serious injury it would cause to your Petitioner, numerous gentry and others residing on the line.

That the prospectuses and advertisements issued by the Company for making the said railway, state the capital of the said Company to be 1,200,000 *l.*, in shares of 50 *l.* each; and in that calculation is included the making branch railways to join the Leicester and Swannington Railway, and to the towns of Northampton and Stamford, which branches extend upwards of 25 miles in length, whilst, by the estimate of the engineer to the Company, it appears that the expense of making the main line (without the said 25 miles of branch railway) will be 1,100,000 *l.*

That the copies of the Parliamentary deeds or contracts deposited in the Private Bill Office of your Honourable House purport to contain subscriptions to the amount of 600,000 *l.* or thereabouts, being nominally only one-half of the proposed amount of capital of the said Company, and little more than one-half of the estimated expense of making the main line alone of the said railway.

That your Petitioner has been informed, and believes the same to be true, that application has been made at the places of abode of many of those who have signed the Parliamentary deeds and subscription lists, and that the subscribers cannot now be found; that many of the following persons are not of the profession, trade or calling there described; that some have left the residences named by them in the said deeds, and cannot now be met with; that most of the following persons whose names are attached to the said deeds or lists are in very indigent circumstances; that many of them were induced to sign the said deeds and subscribe the lists for the numbers of shares and for the amounts in money set opposite to their respective names, without being shareholders; that many of them have not paid the deposits due thereon; that their names are attached to other subscription lists for a considerable number of shares, and that they would, if called upon, be totally unable to fulfil the contracts entered into by them:—

NAME.	ADDRESS.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.
			£.
John Charles Ord - -	172, Regent-street, esq. - - - -	100	5,000
Geo. Cole - - -	172, Regent-street, gent. - - - -	50	2,500
Wm. Dorrington - -	9, Harleyford-place, Kensington, agent -	220	11,000
John Pellat - - -	7, Freeman's-court, Cornhill, gent. - -	30	1,500
Wm. Wright - - -	16, Great Charlotte-street, Blackfriars, gent.	270	13,500
Geo. W. Morrison - -	56, Basinghall-street, gent. - - -	210	10,500
Wm. Bamfield - - -	7, Sweeting's-alley, boot-maker - -	40	2,000
John Edward Stokes -	4, Bank-chambers, broker - - -	80	4,000
Wm. Reslen - - -	21, Lombard-street, gent. - - -	120	6,000
Wm. White - - -	56, Lime-street, gent. - - - -	20	1,000
Francesco Amadio - -	10, Red-cross-street, City, optician - -	50	2,500
Joseph Amadio - -	118, St. John's-street-road, optician - -	30	1,500
Geo. A. Broad - -	Union-road, Clapham, gent. - - -	120	6,000
R. Blackmore - - -	Bonner's Hall, Hackney, gent. - -	70	3,500
Wm. Hamilton - -	15, George-street, Lambeth, gent. - -	100	5,000
John Jackson - - -	14, Dorset-crescent, gent. - - -	310	15,500
Charles Williams - -	37, Old Broad-street, accountant - -	70	3,500

No. 2.
Petition of Sir H. Halford, Bart.

NAME.	ADDRESS.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.
			£.
Josh. Acquilar - - -	45, St. John-street, Clerkenwell, gent. -	50	2,500
John Reed - - -	20, Baker-street, gent. - - - -	100	5,000
Vernon Prankerd - -	21, Castle-street, Finsbury, gent. - -	20	1,000
Josh. Dandridge - -	102, Wood-street, gent. - - - -	30	1,500
Richard Rickards - -	9, Temple-place, Hackney-road, gent. -	40	2,000
Wm. Bloxam - - -	Park-street, gent. - - - - -	140	7,000
R. Brine - - - -	4, Camden-hill Villas, Kensington, gent. -	150	7,500
Wm. Tayler - - -	104, Tyssen, Kingsland, stock-broker -	80	4,000
Wm. Pitfield - - -	190, High-street, Shadwell, gent. - -	60	3,000
John Haley - - -	8, Thomas-street, Mile-end, gent. - -	20	1,000
Charles Frazer - - -	3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road, agent	20	1,000
Benjamin Day - - -	1, Monkwell-street, Falcon-square, gent. -	30	1,500
Wm. Algernon Piercy -	15, Elder-street, Spital-square, gent. -	30	1,500
Thomas Huntley - -	13, East-lane, Bermondsey, merchant -	30	1,500
Charles Moring - -	7, Ferdinand-terrace, Hampstead-road, gent.	50	2,500
H. Allanson - - -	31, Castle-street, Holborn, gent. - -	20	1,000
Alexander Gompertz -	Tiverton-street, Newington, gent. - -	40	2,000
Gustavus Edward Beckering	2, Hill-street, Walworth, gent. - -	50	2,500
Wm. Hall - - -	8, Capel-court, City, gent. - - -	50	2,500
Nathaniel Thompson -	Dalston-Rise, gent. - - - -	20	1,000
Edward Ellis - - -	14, Shaftesbury-terrace, gent. - - -	110	5,500
John H. Morgan - -	13, Yardley-street, Clerkenwell, gent. -	30	1,500
Wm. Cooke - - -	8, Capel-court, Bank, gent. - - -	10	500
Wm. Cooke - - -	8, Capel-court, S. E., gent. - - -	20	1,000
John Spear - - -	2, Prospect-place, Kingsland, broker -	20	1,000
Richard Spencer - -	6, Collingwood-st. City-road, surveyor, &c.	15	750

That your Petitioner has been informed and believes that several others of the subscribers to the said undertaking are persons of insufficient means; but your Petitioner, for obvious reasons, declines stating the names of such parties upon the face of this Petition.

That your Petitioner submits that these facts call for the serious consideration and investigation of your Honourable House; and he confidently relies that, inasmuch as the parties concerned in the matters aforesaid are guilty of a great breach of the privileges of your Honourable House, as well as a deception of the public and the *bonâ fide* subscribers to the said undertaking, your Honourable House will be pleased to give every possible facility to the investigation of the case, with a view, as well to the protection of your Petitioner and other parties interested, as to a proper assertion of the dignity of your Honourable House.

Your Petitioner therefore humbly prays your Honourable House that the said Bill may not be allowed to pass into a law, and that the matters aforesaid may be referred to a Select Committee, to be appointed with all proper powers for the investigation thereof, and that your Petitioner may be heard by himself, his counsel, agents and witnesses upon the matters aforesaid and against the said Bill, and the preamble thereof; and that your Honourable House will take such other measures for the protection and relief of your Petitioner as to your Honourable House shall seem meet.

And your Petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 3.

PARLIAMENTARY CONTRACT.

No. 3. Parliamentary Contract.

THIS Indenture, made the 15th day of April 1836, between Samuel Percival, of the town of Northampton, in the county of Northampton, banker; Holland Goddard, of Market Harborough, in the county of Leicester, banker; and William Langden Hopkinson, of Stamford, in the county of Lincoln, doctor of medicine, of the first part; Sir Arthur De Capell Brooke, of Great Oakley, in the county of Northampton, baronet, and John Charles Ord, of No. 172, Regent-street, Westminster, in the county of Middlesex, esquire, of the second part, and the several other persons whose hands are hereunto subscribed and seals affixed, of the third part; witnesseth, that each of them the said Samuel Percival, Holland Goddard and William Langden Hopkinson, doth hereby for himself, his heirs, executors and administrators, and to the extent only of the sum or amount in money set opposite to his name, and not further or otherwise, covenant, promise and agree with and to the said Sir Arthur De Capell Brooke and John Charles Ord, their executors and administrators; and each of them the said Arthur De Capell Brooke and John Charles Ord, parties hereto of the second part, and also each and every of them the said several persons parties hereto of the third part, doth hereby for himself and for his and her respective heirs, executors and administrators, and to the extent only of the sum or amount in money set opposite to his or her name, covenant, promise, undertake, declare and agree with and to the said Samuel Percival, Holland Goddard and William Langden Hopkinson, parties hereto of the first part, in manner following; that is to say, that they, the said several parties hereto of the first, second and third parts, together with the several other persons who have set their names and affixed their seals to two certain other indentures, bearing even date and of the same tenor, purport and effect herewith, have subscribed the several sums set opposite to their respective names, for the purpose of making and establishing a railway, to be called by the name of "The South Midland Counties Railway," or by such other name or names as may at any time hereafter be adopted by the committee of management engaged in promoting the establishment of such railway; the same to commence at the London and Birmingham Railway, in or near the parish of Blisworth, passing by or near the towns of Northampton and Market Harborough, and ending in or near the town of Leicester, with a branch from or near the said town of Market Harborough to the town or borough of Stamford, and also with such other branch or branches from the said main railway or branch to any towns or places or works lying at a distance not exceeding ten miles from the said main railway, by such course, route or line respectively as may be hereafter by such directors deemed necessary or desirable; together with proper wharfs, docks, basins, quays, warehouses and other works, erections and conveniences thereto respectively appertaining; the same respectively to be made, constructed, established and conducted in such manner as shall be provided for by an Act or Acts of Parliament to be applied for in the next session of Parliament, or in case such Act or Acts shall not be applied for, or if applied for shall not be obtained, in the next session, then such as shall or may be applied for and obtained in any subsequent session of Parliament, in which Act or Acts it is intended to introduce a clause to save harmless the several subscribers and proprietors of shares, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, from being liable in any event for any larger or other sum than what shall be so respectively subscribed by each of them as aforesaid. And this indenture further witnesseth, that they, the said several persons, parties hereto respectively, or their respective heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, shall and will well and truly pay, or cause to be paid, the amount subscribed by each of them respectively, within seven years from the date hereof, in such sums and at such places and times as until the passing of the said Act or Acts shall be required by the committee for the time being engaged in conducting the said undertaking, and after the passing of such Act or Acts as the directors or others authorized by the said Act or Acts shall direct or appoint. And they, the said several persons, parties hereto, for themselves respectively, and for their several and respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, do, and each of them doth, hereby give and grant unto the committee for the time being, engaged in conducting the said undertaking, full power and authority to fix upon and from time to time to alter and vary as well the site or spot at which the said intended railway or branch shall commence, as also the site or spot at which they shall terminate, and the intermediate course, route or line thereof; and also from time to time determine what other branch or branches shall be made therefrom, and to fix upon and from time to time alter and vary their route, course or line, and also to fix upon and from time to time alter and vary the extent and situation of the wharfs, docks, quays, warehouses and other works, erections and conveniences thereto respectively belonging, and to make or renew applications to Parliament for all or any of such purposes, from time to time, as they in their discretion shall think proper; and to confine the application or applications to Parliament, in the next or any future session, to any portion of the main line, omitting all or any of the branches and deferring the application for the remainder of such main line, or any part or parts thereof, and for all or any of the branches, to a future session or sessions. And, lastly, they the said several persons, parties hereto respectively, do hereby severally, for themselves and for their several and respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, undertake and agree that in the event

No. 3. Parliamentary Contract.

event of such Act or Acts not being passed into a law, that each of them severally and respectively shall and will well and truly bear, pay, allow and discharge the expenses already incurred, or hereafter to be incurred, attending the surveys and estimates for the said railway, branches and works, solicitors' and counsels' fees and charges, travelling expenses, and all other costs and charges of every description incident to the proposed undertaking, and to the application or applications to Parliament; such expenses, costs and charges to be computed and assessed rateably upon the amount of the shares or sums subscribed by each of the said several persons parties to these presents. In witness whereof, the said parties to these presents have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

Appendix, No. 4.

SUBSCRIBERS' AGREEMENT.

No. 4. Subscribers' Agreement.

South Midland Counties Railway:—Dated 15 April 1836.

We, the several persons who have hereunto subscribed our names, being severally subscribers to an undertaking for the making and constructing of a railway to be called "The South Midland Counties Railway," or by such other name or names as may be hereafter adopted by the committee of management for the time being engaged in promoting such undertaking, do hereby recognize and acknowledge the following persons as such committee; namely, Samuel Percival, Edward Harrison Barwell, Thomas Sharp, Thomas Grundy, alderman, William Williams, William Collins, alderman, John Freeman, Henry Billington Whitworth, Henry Fenton Stockburn, alderman, John Phipps, the Reverend Sir George Robinson, bart., Sir Arthur de Capell Brooke, bart., William de Capell Brooke, esq., Holland Goddard, John Abbey, Henry Gatty, John Nunneley, Robert Benjamin Heygate, Joseph Scott, Thomas Hubbard, William Langden Hopkinson, M. D., Francis Simpson, Charles Lowe, Richard Newcomb, James Bryan, Valentine Godfrey, Tebbutt, Francis Jelley, Thomas Mills, Richard Knight, Robert Birkley, William Hind, H. Chamberlain, John Ellis, Jones, Joseph Ellis, Thomas Nunneley, and John Charles Ord. And we do hereby, in pursuance of the said measure, and in addition to a certain deed or parliamentary contract bearing even date herewith, under our respective hands and seals, severally and respectively, and for our several and respective executors and administrators, promise and agree to and with the said Samuel Percival, Holland Goddard and William Langden Hopkinson, that we severally, and our several and respective executors and administrators, shall and will faithfully conform to and abide by the several rules and regulations hereinafter mentioned and set forth, as devised by the said committee for the time being, having the management and conduct of the said undertaking, until an Act or Acts of Parliament shall be obtained; that is to say,

First. That the said committee or any board or meeting thereof, constructed according to the provisions hereinafter contained, shall have full and ample power for carrying the undertaking as described in the said parliamentary contract into effect, and for that purpose to cause the requisite surveys to be made, to obtain estimates, to make arrangements with landowners and others, to carry on such opposition or oppositions to any other line or lines of railway, or to withdraw such opposition or oppositions in any manner or upon such terms as they may think proper, to make calls on the subscribers for money, and generally to adopt all and every such measures as the said committee may in their judgment consider or be advised as expedient or necessary, with a view to obtain an Act or Acts of Parliament for the establishment of the said undertaking.

Second. That the majority of members attending any meeting or board of the committee, such meeting consisting of not less than seven members, shall bind all the members, whether present or absent; and the chairman or other member presiding at any such meeting or board shall have a double or casting vote.

Third. That the said committee shall have power from time to time to add to their number from among the subscribers to the undertaking, holding ten shares at the least, and to supply any vacancies that may occur in the committee, and also to appoint sub-committees of management in London, Northampton, Market Harborough, Stamford and Leicester, or any other places, delegating to such sub-committee such duties and powers as the said committee hereby appointed shall think proper.

Fourth. That the said committee shall have full power to appoint, suspend, or remove and re-appoint such bankers, solicitors, engineers, surveyors, clerks, agents, servants and workmen, and to pay and allow all such salaries and recompences as the said committee shall deem right, and to enter into contracts and agreements for the completion of the proposed surveys and all other matters incident to the proposed Act or Acts, and also to apply any monies which shall come to their hands in pursuance of calls made or to be made by them on the subscription as aforesaid, in payment as well of all salaries, recompences and engagements as aforesaid, and of the expenses of soliciting and obtaining an Act or Acts of Parliament as aforesaid, as also all the costs, charges and expenses which may have been or may be incurred in any parliamentary opposition or oppositions to any other line or lines of railway or otherwise, and also the costs, charges and expenses of the provisional committees hitherto acting at Northampton, Market Harborough, Stamford and Leicester.

No. 4 Subscribers' Agreement.

Fifth. That a capital of 1,200,000 *l.*, subject to such augmentation or diminution of capital or consolidation of shares as the committee shall think fit, shall be raised in shares of 50 *l.* each.

Sixth. That every person becoming a subscriber for any number of shares shall at the time of subscribing pay a deposit of 1 *l.* per share, and such additional call or calls as the said committee shall from time to time make, but not exceeding 2 *l.* per share, until the said Act or Acts of Parliament shall have been obtained.

Seventh. That any subscriber not paying such additional calls within one calendar month after notice thereof given by advertisement in the London Gazette, and in three or more such papers as the said committee or directors shall order, shall forfeit all monies he or she shall have paid in respect of his or her shares, together with such shares and all right and interest whatsoever in the said undertaking.

As witness our hands this 15th day of April 1836.

Appendix, No. 5.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
Arthur de Capell Brooke	Great Oakley	baronet	50	2,500	(L. S.)	
John Charles Ord	172, Regent-street	esquire	100	5,000	—	
Holland Goddard	Market Harborough	banker	25	1,250	—	
John Nunneley	ditto	grocer	10	500	—	
Thomas Mills	Stamford	gentleman	10	500	—	
Val. Godfrey	Duddington	miller	20	1,000	—	
Torkington and Sons	Stamford	attorneys	10	500	—	
James Ley Douglass	Harborough	solicitor	20	1,000	—	
J. P. Bryan	Wakerley	merchant	10	500	—	
George Cole	172, Regent-street	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
William Dorrington	9, Harleford-street, Kennington.	agent	220	11,000	—	
J. Tulloch	Bow	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
John Pellat	5, Freeman's-court, Cornhill.	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Henry Hills	New-road, Camberw.	gentleman	100	5,000	—	
William Wright	16, Great Charlotte-street, Blackfriars.	gentleman	270	13,500	—	
George W. Morrison	56, Basinghall-street	gentleman	210	10,500	—	
George Lister	9, Hart-street	gentleman	14	700	—	
William Bamfield	7, Sweeting-alley	boot-maker	40	2,000	—	
John Edward Stokes	4, Bank-chambers	broker	80	4,000	—	
William Risbec	21, Lombard-street	gentleman	120	6,000	—	
William White	56, Lime-street City	gentleman	20	1,000	—	John Gustard, 6, Bedford-street, Covent-garden, London.
Francesco Amadio	18, Redcross-st. City	optician	50	2,500	—	
Joseph Amadio	118, St. John-st.-road	optician	30	1,500	—	
James Milner	Pancras-vale, Hampstead-road.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
James Edward Groom	12, Watling-street	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Robert Smith	New-court, Bow-lane	merchant	40	2,000	—	
F. V. Eck	14, Paul's-terrace, Ball's-pond-gate.	broker	100	5,000	—	
John Scarborough	50, Bow-lane	warehouseman	50	2,500	—	
George A. Broad	Union-rd. Clapham	gentleman	120	6,000	—	
Charles Griffith	9, Myrtle-st. Hoxton	gentleman	60	3,000	—	
R. Blackmore	Bonney-hall, Hacky	gentleman	70	3,500	—	
Benjamin Heenan	39, Prince's-road, Kennington.	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Henry Tomkins	2, Charlton-place, Islington.	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
William Hamilton	15, George-street, Lambeth.	gentleman	100	5,000	—	
James Railton	2, Queen-st. Islington	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
O. R. Johnson	4, Aldermanbury	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
John Jackson	14, Dorset-crescent	gentleman	310	15,500	—	
John Reed	20, Baker-street	gentleman	100	5,000	—	
Charles Williams	37, Old Broad-st.	accountant	70	3,500	—	
Joseph Aguilar	45, St. John-street, Clerkenwell; America-square.	gentleman	50	2,500	—	

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
William Peters	7, Vine-street	gentleman	20	1,000	(L. S.)	
William Augustus Erck	21, Lombard-street	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Stopford Jones	Hambro'-wharf	gentleman	100	5,000	—	
Vernon Prankerd	21, Castle-street, Finsbury.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Joseph Dandridge	102, Wood-street	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Frederick Blaksley	12, Paragon, New Kent-road.	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
Archibald Kerr	46, Robert-street, Hoxton.	gentleman	55	2,750	—	
Richard Rickards	9, Temple-place, Hackney-road.	gentleman	40	2,000	—	
George Sanders	2, Westbrook-cottages, Smith-street, Kensington.	gentleman	130	6,500	—	
W. Bloxam	Park-street	gentleman	140	7,000	—	
James Edwards	17, Windsor-terrace, City-road.	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
R. Brine	4, Camden-hill villas	gentleman	150	7,500	—	
William Taylor	104, Tyssen, Kingsland.	stock-broker	80	4,000	—	
William Pitfield	190, High-street, Shadwell.	gentleman	60	3,000	—	
Henry William Dinsdale	Rose-villa, Kilburn	gentleman	100	5,000	—	
John Ensten	10, Hart-street, Mark-lane.	merchant	10	500	—	
Robert Fitzroy Holderness	23, Change-alley	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
John Haley	8, Thomas-street, Mile End.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Charles Fraser	3, Buckingham-pl. Old Kent-Road.	agent	20	1,000	—	
Henry Randell	6, Camberwell-grove	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Benjamin Day	1, Monkwell-street, Falcon-square.	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
William Algernon Piercy	15, Elder-street, Spital-square.	gentleman	30	1,500	—	John Gustard.
Robert Maurer	9, South-st. Finsb.	merchant	20	1,000	—	
John Pocock	3, Doddington-grove	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Thomas Huntley	13, East-lane, Bermondsey.	merchant	30	1,500	—	
William Gustard	16, Bedford-street, Covent-garden.		30	1,500	—	
Charles Maring	7, Ferdinand-terrace, Hampstead-road.	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
Walter Keating Kelly	7, Wellington-road, St. John's-wood.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Hunter Gordon	Temple	barrister	50	2,500	—	
Augustus Austen	32, Fitzroy-square	gentleman	60	3,000	—	
Henry Allanson	31, Castle-st. Holb.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
David Duthort	6, Dyer's-court, Aldermanbury.	warehouseman	50	2,500	—	
Thomas Holmes	Bradford, Yorkshire	draper, &c.	10	500	—	
Alexander Gompertz	Tiverton-st. Newing.	gentleman	40	2,000	—	
John Vincenty	Southwark-square	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
George Robinson	White-conduit, Pent.	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Gustavus Edward Beckering	2, Hill-st. Walworth	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
Hugh Evans Fisher	3, Essex-ct. Temple	solicitor	20	1,000	—	
John Smith	174, Fleet-street	gentleman	10	500	—	
William Redgrave	2, Parliament-street	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Henry Druitt	67, Lombard-street	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
Daniel Curling	18, Cheapside	warehouseman	100	5,000	—	
Edward Watson Ellis	26, Mortimer-street, of Leicester.	gentleman	110	5,500	—	
William Burgess	Watford, Herts	gentleman	10	500	—	
John Ellis	Leicester	merchant	20	1,000	—	
James Rolls	94, Stamford-street, London.	colour-maker	5	250	—	
William Hall	8, Capel-court, City	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
Nathaniel Thompson	Dalston-rise	gentleman	20	1,000	—	

(*continued*)

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
Michael Hodsoll Miller -	Scarborough -	clerk - -	4	200	(L. S.)	
Thomas Clarke - - -	Harborough - -	carpet-manufac.	10	500	—	
Edward Ellis - - -	14 Shaftsbury-terr.	gentleman -	110	5,500	—	
John Henry Morgan - -	13' Yardley-street, Clerkenwell.	gentleman -	30	1,500	—	
John Coleman - - -	20, Finsbury-place, Finsbury-square.	ironmonger -	2	100	—	
Charles Munt, pp. for George Woodhall.	York - - - -	merchant -	30	1,500	—	
John Jones - - -	South-place, Kennington-common.	gentleman -	10	500	—	
Edward Wright George -	1, Warnford-ct., City	solicitor -	20	1,000	—	John Gustard.
Thomas Wetherherd - -	Leeds - -	clerk - -	50	2,500	—	
William Cooke - - -	8, Capel-court, Bank	gentleman -	10	500	—	
George R. Medley - -	9, Dobson-terrace, Kennington.	gentleman -	30	1,500	—	
John Spear - - - -	2, Prospect-place, Kingsland.	broker - -	20	1,000	—	
Richard Spencer - - -	6, Collingwood-str. City-road.	surveyor, &c.	15	750	—	
Job Harris - - - -	2, Swan-street, Old Kent-road.	excise-officer -	2	100	—	
George Pickering - -	Chester - -	artist - -	15	750	—	
George Craven - - -	Bridport-st. Liverpl.	book-keeper -	5	250	—	
D. F. Atkinson - - -	School-lane, Liverpl.	attorney -	10	500	—	
Susan Green - - -	King's Buildings, Chester.	- - -	10	500	—	
George A. Franks - -	Barrell Well Cottage, Chester.	professor of music.	5	250	—	
James Carson - - -	8, Mary-bone, Liverpool.	draper - -	10	500	—	
			10	500	—	
James Frith - - -	Weaver-st. Chester	writer - -	10	500	—	
Henry Lucas - - -	Dale-st. Liverpool.	agent - -	10	500	—	
John Charles Bezer - -	10, Clarence-street, Liverpool.	customs -	10	500	—	
John Towne - - -	65, Upper Stanhope-street, Liverpool	gentleman -	10	500	—	
Thomas Hornby - - -	3, Moon-st. Liverpool	commiss^{n}-agent	10	500	—	
Henry Carr - - - -	27, St. Anne-street, Liverpool.	accountant -	25	1,250	—	
James Rowe, jun. - -	15, Mill-street, Tox.-park, Liverpool.	gentleman -	10	500	—	
John Woollright - - -	Bold-st., Liverpool	mercer - -	10	500	—	
Charles R. Taylor - -	Hope-st., Liverpool	merchant -	5	250	—	
Thomas Banner - - -	1, Moss-st., Liverpool	accountant -	20	1,000	—	
Archibald Charles Fairbairn -	6, Mount-pleasant, Liverpool.	book-keeper -	30	1,500	—	John Coglan.
John Woollright - - -	Bold-st., Liverpool	mercer - -	10	500	—	
James Crawford - - -	12, Chester-street, Liverpool.	broker - -	15	750	—	
Peter Leicester - - -	Roscommon-street, Liverpool.	corn-factor -	10	500	—	
Thomas Leicester - -	32, Burlington-street, Liverpool.	corn-dealer -	10	500	—	
Thomas Read - - -	46, Castle-st. Liverpl.	broker - -	10	500	—	
William J. Storey - -	Hatton-grdn, Liverpl.	iron-founder -	10	500	—	
Nicholas E. Browne - -	Morra-st., Liverpool	customs -	10	500	—	
William L. Lawn - -	Brunswick-rd., ditto	accountant -	40	2,000	—	
Thomas Firth - - -	Northwick - -	banker - -	25	1,250	—	
Cornelius Randall - -	Market-street, Manchester.	boot and shoe dealer.	50	2,500	—	
B. Hime - - - -	St. Anne's-square, Manchester.	music-seller -	30	1,500	—	
Edward S. Tuton - -	Lord-st., Liverpool	draper - -	30	1,500	—	
Samuel Fox - - -	Deansgate, Manchester.	flour-dealer -	60	3,000	—	
John Stones - - -	Market-place, Manchester.	bookbinder -	30	1,500	—	
Joseph Zanetti - - -	Exchange-st., Manchester.	print-seller -	30	1,500	—	

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
Elizabeth Lax	Cockpitt-hill, Manchester.	innkeeper	30	1,500	(L. S.)	
James Parr	Market-street, Manchester.	accountant	20	1,000	—	
John Harrop	Upper Brook-street, Manchester.	banker	20	1,000	—	
Morris Jacob	6, Bank-buildings, Manchester.	merchant	30	1,500	—	
Martin Schlesinger	Piccadilly, Bradford	merchant	10	500	—	
James Lambert	ditto	solicitor	20	1,000	—	
Samuel Slack	Grammar-school, Bradford.	clerk	20	1,000	—	
Robert A. Gorell	Rawson's-pl., Brad.	book-keeper	4	200	—	
William Rand	Bradford, Yorkshire	worsted-spinner	20	1,000	—	
John Rand	ditto	worsted-spinner	20	1,000	—	
William M'Turk	ditto	physician	20	1,000	—	
John Smith	Wortley, near Leeds	cloth-manufac.	10	500	—	
James Hope	District-office, Leeds	district-adjutant	20	1,000	—	
S. Newmarch Fowler	York	glover	20	1,000	—	
Joseph Wood, jun.	ditto	cutler, &c.	20	1,000	—	
Benjamin Crosby	ditto	grocer, &c.	18	900	—	
Robert Hudson	ditto	gentleman	50	2,500	—	
Thomas Gatliff	ditto	share-broker	10	500	—	
Samuel Fowler	ditto	glover	20	1,000	—	
William Dobson	Malton, near York	draper	10	500	—	
Henry Pickering	ditto	draper	20	1,000	—	John Coglan.
Henry Hall	York	leather-merch.	10	500	—	
H. Watson	ditto	corn-merchant	40	2,000	—	
George Pitt	Barnsley	merchant	30	1,500	—	
George Harrison	ditto	bookseller	30	1,500	—	
Edward Vickers	Sheffield	corn-miller	30	1,500	—	
Joseph Owen	ditto	draper	100	5,000	—	
Charles Leach Coward	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
Samuel Turner Winstanley	Liverpool	auctioneer	5	250	—	
Henry Norris Winstanley	ditto	auctioneer	10	500	—	
Arthur Henderson	ditto	merchant	15	750	—	
John Dumbell	ditto	builder, &c.	10	500	—	
Thomas Cooke	ditto	broker	10	500	—	
Christopher Carter	Knaresborough	gentleman	40	2,000	—	
George Hogg	Leeds	dyer	20	1,000	—	
John Charlton	Heslington, nr. York	corn-factor	10	500	—	
J. H. Ridsdale	Leeds	broker	100	5,000	—	
Benjamin Dixon	Wakefield	solicitor	10	500	—	
George Wilson	ditto	woollen-draper	10	500	—	
James Horncastle	Holmfirth	merchant	10	500	—	
Jarvis Brady	Barnsley	banker	50	2,500	—	
Samuel Owen, jun.	Sheffield	draper	29	1,450	—	
Herman Edward Leo	Manchester	merchant	30	1,500	—	
Adam Atkinson	ditto	merchant	50	2,500	—	
Thomas Cooke	Liverpool	broker	70	3,500	—	
Samuel Percival	Northampton	banker	25	1,250	—	
Edward Harrison Barwell	ditto	iron-founder	20	1,000	—	
William Williams	ditto	leather-dealer	10	500	—	
Thomas Grundy	ditto	iron-founder	10	500	—	
Thomas Sharp	ditto	engineer	10	500	—	
John Phipps	ditto	draper	10	500	—	
H. B. Whitworth	ditto	banker	10	500	—	
John Freeman	ditto	bookseller	10	500	—	
George Osborn	ditto	grocer	20	1,000	—	James Gustard, 16, Bedford-st. Covent-garden, London.
Thomas Osborn	ditto	grocer	10	500	—	
John Percival	ditto	banker	25	1,250	—	
Richard Phipps	ditto	merchant	10	500	—	
Edward Stanton	ditto	draper	12	600	—	
David Wilkinson	ditto	hosier	10	500	—	
Joseph Adnott	ditto	merchant	10	500	—	
Joseph Adnott, jun.	ditto	merchant	14	700	—	
Philadelphius Jeyes	ditto	druggist	2	100	—	
Edward Cotton	ditto	currier	20	1,000	—	
William Porter	ditto	brazier	22	1,100	—	

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
W. Strong	Hardingstone	gentleman	14	700	(L. S.)	
W. W. Congreve	Cotton-end	merchant	5	250	—	
G. Barry	Northampton	chemist	5	250	—	
John Percival, jun.	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
John Jones	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
Martin Dickens	ditto	innholder	2	100	—	
William Muddiman	ditto	currier	4	200	—	
Gray Hester	ditto	grocer, &c.	5	250	—	
George Abbey	ditto	solicitor	6	300	—	
Joseph Cooper	ditto	butcher	10	500	—	
Edward L. Mayor	ditto	innkeeper	5	250	—	
For J. B. & D. Hewlett, J. B. Hewlett.	ditto	ironmonger	10	500	—	
J. B. Hewlett	ditto	ironmonger	50	2,500	—	
Joel Edens	ditto	shoe-manufac.	5	250	—	
Isaiah Crick	ditto	cooper	4	200	—	
Thomas Smith	ditto	plumber & glaz.	2	100	—	
Joseph Crick	ditto	cooper	8	400	—	
George Peach	ditto	woolstapler	5	250	—	
Thomas Wheeler	ditto	bookseller & sta.	6	300	—	
William Harris	ditto	chemist & drug.	6	300	—	
Thomas Hallam	ditto	shoe-manufac.	5	250	—	
William Roe	ditto	baker	6	300	—	
Samuel Rice	ditto	butcher	10	500	—	
William King	ditto	innholder	2	100	—	
William Hollis, jun.	ditto	shoe-manufac.	5	250	—	
John Barringer	ditto	grocer	2	100	—	
William Franklin	ditto	draper	6	300	—	
George Cooke	ditto	attorney-at-law	6	300	—	
Jon. Dadford	ditto	pawnbroker	5	250	—	
For Parsons & Chennell, Henry Parsons.	ditto	drapers	2	100	—	
Robert Harvey	ditto	draper	4	200	—	
John Ashby	ditto	grocer	2	100	—	
Mary Edens	ditto	shoe-manufac.	5	250	—	James Gustard.
Elizabeth Jee	ditto	shoe-manufac.	5	250	—	
Joseph Ashby	ditto	ironmonger	2	100	—	
Richard Dennis	ditto	auctioneer	5	250	—	
J. T. Bacon	ditto	druggist	2	100	—	
Robert Bartram	ditto	hosier	2	100	—	
W. Sutton	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
W. Berrill	ditto	perfumer, &c.	2	100	—	
David Gourlay	ditto	tailor	2	100	—	
For H. & E. Greville, H. M. Greville.	ditto	druggists	5	250	—	
John Briltell	ditto	iron-founder	5	250	—	
H. Terry	ditto	surgeon	10	500	—	
T. K. Higgins	ditto	innholder	3	150	—	
David Dadford	ditto	silversmith	3	150	—	
Esther Willson	Cotton-end	widow	20	1,000	—	
J. P. Kilpin	Northampton	tailor	2	100	—	
John Hamson	St. James-end	innkeeper	4	200	—	
James Atkins	Northampton	nurseryman	6	300	—	
John Stevenson, sen.	ditto	wine-merchant	5	250	—	
Samuel Stanton	ditto	maltster	10	500	—	
T. Pressland	ditto	draper	3	150	—	
Sam. Peach	ditto	gentleman	5	250	—	
James Mackness	ditto	surgeon	5	250	—	
Charles S. Adkins	ditto	printer	10	500	—	
John Kightley	ditto	gentleman	5	250	—	
For M. & E. Powell, Elizabeth Powell.	ditto	fishmonger	2	100	—	
John Macguire	ditto	upholsterer	2	100	—	
John Bowman Boyal	ditto	grocer	2	100	—	
Edward Cook	ditto	shoe-manufac.	3	150	—	
J. D. Penn	ditto	shoe-manufac.	2	100	—	
Samuel Hesey	ditto	timber-merchant	5	250	—	
William Dunkley	ditto	butcher	5	250	—	
A. Robertson	ditto	M. D.	6	300	—	

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£		
Charles Britten	Northampton	solicitor	2	100	(L. S.)	
James Stringer	ditto	solicitor	5	250	—	
Thomas Hagger	ditto	brewer	5	250	—	
Benjamin Clark	ditto	surgeon	10	500	—	
For J. & R. Groome, Richard Groome.	ditto	boot and shoe manufacturer.	5	250	—	
Thomas Richardson	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
Henry Jacob	ditto	builder	2	100	—	
Thomas Hands	ditto	maltster	4	200	—	
Jabez Adkins	ditto	miller, &c.	6	300	—	
Samuel Walker	ditto	tailor	5	250	—	
Thomas Shaw	ditto	coach-proprietor	10	500	—	
R. B. Heygate	Market Harborough	surgeon	15	750	—	
John Abbey	ditto	surgeon	20	1,000	—	
Joseph Scott	Great Bowden	timber-merchant	10	500	—	
J. G. Franklin	Market Harborough	grocer	10	500	—	
Charles Goddard	ditto	ironmonger	10	500	—	
William Shepard	ditto	chemist	10	500	—	
Felix Falknor	ditto	banker's clerk	5	250	—	
Thomas Abbott	ditto	bookseller	10	500	—	
William Holloway	ditto	grazier	10	500	—	
Thomas Hind	ditto	tanner	10	500	—	
Henry Gatty	ditto	surgeon	10	500	—	
James Abbey	ditto	solicitor	10	500	—	
John Newham	ditto	coach-maker	10	500	—	
Thomas Harris	ditto	schoolmaster	10	500	—	
Thomas Hubbard	ditto	grocer	10	500	—	
James Kidman	ditto	ironmonger	5	250	—	
William Holloway, jun.	ditto	auctioneer	10	500	—	
Joseph Nunneley	ditto	grocer	5	250	—	
Rowland Seaton	ditto	draper	10	500	—	
Charlotte F. Douglass	ditto	spinster	10	500	—	
William Flint	ditto	wine-merchant	10	500	—	
Thomas Heygate	ditto	surgeon	5	250	—	
William Carr	ditto	innkeeper	10	500	—	James Gustard.
James Goddard	ditto	banker	20	1,000	—	
Thomas G. Goward	ditto	grocer	10	500	—	
William Ward	ditto	gentleman	12	600	—	
John Addy	ditto	innkeeper	1	50	—	
William Slater	Great Bowden	maltster	5	250	—	
Thomas Flavell	Market Harborough	grocer & chandler	10	500	—	
George Clarke	ditto	carpet-manufac.	10	500	—	
James Tiptaft Seaton	ditto	draper	10	500	—	
William Buszard	ditto	grocer	10	500	—	
Ann Riddell Spriggs	ditto	spinster	6	300	—	
William Burton	ditto	grocer	10	500	—	
Moses Burnby Gronow	ditto	draper	10	500	—	
David Burditt	ditto	carpenter	2	100	—	
Sarah Burditt	ditto	widow	2	100	—	
John Sulley	ditto	shoemaker	2	100	—	
William Andrews	ditto	solicitor	10	500	—	
Joseph Bull	ditto	cooper	2	100	—	
Joseph Pickering	ditto	grocer	5	250	—	
Sophia Hodgkinson Gronow	ditto	spinster	8	400	—	
William Smith	Little Bowden	gentleman	10	500	—	
James Philips	Leicester	banker	10	500	—	
B. E. Bennett	Marston Trussell	gentleman	10	500	—	
G. G. Unsworth	Liverpool	broker	5	250	—	
William Swan Hamilton	Mill-lane, West Derby	gentleman	25	1,250	—	
William Newsom	Old Hall-st. Liverp.	tea-dealer	25	1,250	—	
William Brown, jun.	Edge-hill	merchant	10	500	—	
Egbert Dircks	Sidney-place, Edge-hill, Liverpool.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
John Hastings	Lord-st., Liverpool	saddler	10	500	—	
Robert Wilson	Everton, Liverpool	merchant	5	250	—	
Robert H. Hamilton	West Derby	merchant	25	1,250	—	
John Troughear	Great Homer-st. Liver.	merchant	10	500	—	
Henry Stafford	28, Bradport-street, Liverpool.	bookseller and stationer.	5	250	—	

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
E. W. Garbel	Chester-st. Liverpool	merchant	10	500	(L. S.)	
Samuel W. Berend	Bold-st., Liverpool	dentist	175	8,750	—	
John Found	3, Water-st. Liverpool	book-keeper	10	500	—	
George M'Morine	1, Drury-lane, Liverp.	merchant	10	500	—	
John Appleton	53, Byrom-st. Liverp.	tea-dealer	5	250	—	
Wm. Fk. Lindon	Berry-st., Liverpool	wine-merchant	10	500	—	
James Hart	Toxteth-park, Liverp.	commission-agnt.	10	500	—	
Moss Joseph	Liverpool	merchant	54	2,700	—	
George Pitts	ditto	merchant	10	500	—	
Thomas Baty	Mount-pleasant, Liverpool.	spirit-dealer	5	250	—	
John Henton	Old Hall-st. Liverp.	flour-dealer	15	750	—	
Richard Price	West Derby	flour-dealer	10	500	—	
Charles Price	ditto	flour-dealer	5	250	—	
Gilbt. W. M'Gloin	Vernon-st. Liverpool	provision-broker	10	500	—	
Henry Lowery Medder	Old Hall-st. Liverp.	pawnbroker	10	500	—	
Edward Hime	Seel-st. Liverpool	music-seller	15	750	—	
S. Joseph	18, Temple-st. Liverp.	merchant	10	500	—	
Jos. Boumphrey	44, Faulkner-street, Liverpool.	builder	10	500	—	
John Miller	Gt. Oxford-st. Liverp.	corn-merchant	15	750	—	
John Gilton	Liverpool	merchant	15	750	—	
John Palin	Chester	grocer	10	500	—	
Robert Lawn	Liverpool	collector's clerk	10	500	—	
William Royle	ditto	book-keeper	10	500	—	
John Layland	ditto	book-keeper	50	2,500	—	
Thomas Cooke	ditto	merchant	10	500	—	
William Brownless	ditto	book-keeper	40	2,000	—	
Thomas Hill, jun.	30, Pleasant-st. Liverp.	book-keeper	5	250	—	
Thomas Jagger	25, Warwick-street, Toxteth-park.	broker	10	500	—	
Thomas Henton	93, Old Hall-street	flour-dealer	5	250	—	
Thomas Jones	3, Brook-sq. Liverp.	victualler	5	250	—	
George Robinson	Castle-st. Liverpool	bookseller	20	1,000	—	James Gustard,
John Woodward	King-st. Soho, Liverp.	merchant	10	500	—	
Morgan O'Connell	North John-street	merchant	20	1,000	—	
Morgan O'Connell	ditto	merchant	10	500	—	
Daniel Williams	Windsor, Liverpool	coach-proprietor	20	1,000	—	
Thomas Court	Sandon-st. Liverpool	sec. Underwriters' Association.	10	500	—	
Henry Hime	9, Grove-street	attorney	15	750	—	
Phillip Nathan	25, Castle-st. Liverp.	silversmith	5	250	—	
John Healey	10, Edge-vale	book-keeper	10	500	—	
William Brend	100, Scotland-road, Liverpool.	boot-maker	10	500	—	
Jonathan Dodgson	21, Hanover-st. Liverp.	hemp-merchant	30	1,500	—	
Peter Ormerod	Douglas, Isle of Man	ironmonger	30	1,500	—	
John Jones	14, Earl-st. Liverpool	book-keeper	10	500	—	
Thomas H. Stephens	21, Vine-st. Liverpool	merchant	5	250	—	
William Turner	Christian-st. Liverp.	cabinet-maker	5	250	—	
J. Oliver Jones	Castle-st. Liverpool	solicitor	10	500	—	
William Higgins	Temple-ct. Liverpool	merchant	5	250	—	
John C. Grocott	18, Juvenal-st. Liverp.	attorney-at-law	10	500	—	
William Parlour	Exchange-st. Liverp.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Edward Kent	Mason-st. Edge-hill	gentleman	15	750	—	
Benjamin Wright	Mill-street, Liverpool	broker	10	500	—	
John Marshall	15, Duke-st. Liverp.	surgeon	10	500	—	
Joseph Humphreys	Liverpool	coffee-roaster	15	750	—	
James Manifold	Covent-garden, Liv.	tea-dealer	5	250	—	
William Milner	Liverpool	manufacturer	40	2,000	—	
John S. Jackson	4, Tabley-st. Liverp.	merchant	35	1,750	—	
Alexander Kerr	Woodside, Cheshire	master mariner	20	1,000	—	
Stephen Welsh	Gt. Oxford-st. Liverp.	bread-baker	5	250	—	
Edward Collinson	Dale-st. Liverpool	broker	15	750	—	
J. G. Dewhurst	Jubilee-buildings, Lord-st. Liverpool.	attorney	5	250	—	
George Doncaster	15, Gt. George-street, Liverpool.	merchant	15	750	—	
Daniel Simmins	3, Cleveland-sq. Liver.	broker	10	500	—	

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
John Andrews Fell	Woodside, Cheshire	broker	10	500	(L. S.)	
Paul W. Weber	Scotland-road, Liverp.	iron-founder	10	500	—	
Samuel Rawland	Elliot-st. Liverpool	tea-dealer	20	1,000	—	
C. E. Everest	St. Ann-st. Liverp.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
F. M. Overton	St. Ann-st. Liverp.	merchant	10	500	—	
J. Reckless	25, Berkeley-street	merchant	10	500	—	
Thomas Daniel	111, St. James's-st.	printer	10	500	—	
T. C. Braun	37, Soho-st. Liverp.	clerk	10	500	—	
John Shaw	4, India-bdgs. Liver.	merchant	45	2,250	—	
John Barclay	24, Pleasant-street, Liverpool.	surveyor	5	250	—	
Arch. Cleiland Tweedie	11, Brownlow-hill, Liverpool.	broker	10	500	—	
James Collins	11, Norton-st. Liverp.	physician	15	750	—	
John Williams	4, Great George-street, Liverpool.	boarding-house keeper.	5	250	—	
Andrew Ralph	10, Ranelagh-street, Liverpool.	cooper	5	250	—	
Joseph Mossop	Liverpool, Byrom-st.	cheesemonger	10	500	—	
William Cooke	Byrom-st. Liverpool	watchmaker	5	250	—	
Joshua Van Owen	Great George-street, Liverpool.	surgeon	5	250	—	
Thomas Green	Regent-road, Clarence-dock, Liverp.	agent	5	250	—	
John Redfern	Bedford-street, Harrington.	painter	5	250	—	
W. B. Bragg	49, Grafton-st. Liverp.	shipwright	10	500	—	
Robert Lucy	23, Stafford-st. Liverp.	gold-dial-maker	5	250	—	
William Critchley	47, Mersey-st. Liverp.	pawnbroker	25	1,250	—	
William Holdsworth	11, Parr-st. Liverp.	gentleman	25	1,250	—	
Sarah Hughes	Old Haymarket, Liverpool.	widow	10	500	—	
William Parr	20, Whitechapel, Liverpool.	corset-maker	5	250	—	
John Cross	8, Aigburth-street, Windsor.	gentleman	50	2,500	—	James Gustard.
John Johnston	18, King-st. Soho, Liverpool.	bookkeeper	5	250	—	
Robert Fowler	34, Water-st. Liverp.	merchant	10	500	—	
R. L. Townsend	St. Michael's, near Liverpool.	clerk	10	500	—	
Robert Marshall	St. James's-road, Liverpool.	merchant	10	500	—	
John Kennedy	Walnut-st. Liverp.	grocer	10	500	—	
P. Robinson	King-street, Soho, Liverpool.	accountant	5	250	—	
W. W. Smith	King-street, Liverp.	merchant	20	1,000	—	
William C. Lennox	Liverpool (Dale-st.)	merchant	5	250	—	
James R. Cooper	Liverpool, 40, London-road.	ironmonger	10	500	—	
William Tomlinson	Castle-st. Liverpool	merchant	15	750	—	
Robert D. Reeves	Everton, Liverpool	merchant	5	250	—	
William Allender	Castle-st. Liverpool	hatter	5	250	—	
John Radcliffe	Wavertree, Liverp.	bookkeeper	5	250	—	
William Taylor	66, Rose-pl. Liverp.	bookkeeper	10	500	—	
Joseph Stevens	Park-road, Liverp.	flour-dealer	20	1,000	—	
Thomas Lightfoot	Everton, Liverpool	broker	10	500	—	
George F. Fairclough	5, West Derby-st.	solicitor	10	500	—	
John Woollright	Bold-street	silk-mercer	40	2,000	—	
John Blake	Bold-st. Liverpool	chemist	20	1,000	—	
Robert Clough	2, Mulberry-street	excise officer	5	250	—	
Charles Owen	13, London-road	boot, shoe wareh.	10	500	—	
Richard Widdows, jun.	9, Birkett-st. Liverp.	bookkeeper	10	500	—	
Charles Shaw	Devon-st. Liverpool	clerk	30	1,500	—	
Barnit Levi	Lime-st. Liverpool	watch manufac.	10	500	—	
John Fowler	Hunter-st. Liverp.	broker	5	250	—	
J. Hancock Grundy	Wood-st. Liverpool	merchant	10	500	—	
Edward Blundell	Great Homer-street, Everton.	tobacco-manufacturer.	10	500	—	

(*continued*)

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
John Dignan	20, Harfort-st. Liverp.	bookkeeper	10	500	(L. S.)	
William Miller	8, Percy-st. Liverp.	wine-merchant	10	500	—	
W. A. Bond	10, Pembroke-place, Liverpool.	bookkeeper	10	500	—	
Henry Layland	16, Finch-st. Liverp.	bookkeeper	10	500	—	
Henry Croft	Comus-st. Liverp.	soap-manufac.	20	1,000	—	
George Adam Green	Roscoe-st. Liverp.	spirit-dealer	10	500	—	
John Fletcher	Toxteth-park, Liverp.	broker	100	5,000	—	
Richard S. Robinson	Bold-street, Liverp.	upholsterer	20	1,000	—	
James Radlin	Ranelagh-pl. Liverp.	hotel-keeper	20	1,000	—	
Richard Bright	Bold-street, Liverp.	silk-mercer	40	2,000	—	
Donald Nicholson	Church-st. Liverp.	hatter	20	1,000	—	
Edward Willmer	ditto	bookseller	20	1,000	—	
Edward Willmer	ditto	bookseller	50	2,500	—	
David Smith	ditto	bookseller	20	1,000	—	
Thomas Tetley	ditto	hair-dresser	5	250	—	
John Jackson	Dale-street, Liverp.	bootmaker	10	500	—	
William W. Cochrane	Railway-yard, Liverp.	bookkeeper	5	250	—	
John J. Hamilton	4, Tabley-st. Liverp.	merchant	50	2,500	—	
Thomas W. Manlove	14, Spring-field, Liverpool.	merchant	10	500	—	
Edward Jones	Lancelot's Hay, Liver.	flour dealer	10	500	—	
William Brown, jun.	Liverpool	merchant	10	500	—	
Thomas Hebblewhite	ditto	wine-merchant	25	1,250	—	
John Kaye	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
John Clarke	ditto	plumber, &c.	10	500	—	
Edward Widdows	ditto	bookkeeper	5	250	—	
J. B. Carson	ditto	manufacturer	10	500	—	
Thomas Layland	ditto	flour-dealer	10	500	—	
James Collins	11, Norton-st. Liverp.	physician	10	500	—	
Joachim Andrade	67, Castle-st. Liverp.	solicitor	10	500	—	
Thomas Stevens	Thornton-place, Toxteth-park.	corn dealer	10	500	—	
Charles Sharp	Liverpool	tobacco-manuf.	10	500	—	James Gustard.
Robert Cooke	ditto	broker	15	750	—	
William Stock	ditto	glass-merchant	15	750	—	
Thomas Coglan	ditto	broker	10	500	—	
Henry Schroeder	ditto	book-keeper	30	1,500	—	
Nicholas Martindale	ditto	manufacturer	10	500	—	
C. J. Townley	ditto	broker	30	1,500	—	
C. H. Townley	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
John Ball	Seacombe	schoolmaster	5	250	—	
John Watson	Leeds	cloth-merchant	50	2,500	—	
John Blackburn	ditto	solicitor	10	500	—	
William Osburn	ditto	wine-merchant	10	500	—	
N. P. Simes	ditto	wool-merchant	10	500	—	
John Ridsdale, jun.	ditto	merchant	50	2,500	—	
Thomas P. Dickinson	ditto	merchant	4	200	—	
J. Dresser	ditto	corn-factor	4	200	—	
James Anderson	ditto	clerk (Post-office).	16	800	—	
Edward Smeeton	ditto	chemist	40	2,000	—	
C. M. Wilks	ditto	innkeeper	10	500	—	
William Soulby	ditto	corn-factor	10	500	—	
Richard Mirfin	ditto	draper	50	2,500	—	
Richard Beaumont	ditto	cashier	30	1,500	—	
James Scarth	ditto	bank manager	50	2,500	—	
Thomas Everard Upton, jun.	ditto	solicitor	4	200	—	
Thomas Sidney	ditto	tea-dealer	20	1,000	—	
Phineas Abrahams	ditto	silversmith	40	2,000	—	
John Dawson	ditto	tailor	6	300	—	
Joseph Carter	ditto	tailor	6	300	—	
George Thomas Parnell	ditto	jeweller	6	300	—	
William Crawford	ditto	2d dragoons	20	1,000	—	
Josh. Singleton	ditto	ironmonger	10	500	—	
J. H. Ridsdale	ditto	agent	40	2,000	—	
George Ridsdale	ditto	agent	20	1,000	—	
W. N. Nicholson	Roundhay, near Leeds	gentleman	100	5,000	—	
Radford Potts	Leeds	wool-merchant	10	500	—	

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
James Robinson	Leeds	merchant	50	2,500	(L. S.)	
C. S. Jackson	ditto	merchant	10	500	—	
J. B. Baldwin	ditto	merchant	20	1,000	—	
William Secker	Wakefield	merchant	10	500	—	
Francis Cardwell	ditto	druggist	10	500	—	
John Snow	ditto	accountant	10	500	—	
William Starkey	ditto	surgeon	10	500	—	
C. M. Dixon	ditto	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Daniel Haigh, jun.	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
John Tolson	ditto	manufacturer	10	500	—	
Henry Dunn	ditto	surgeon	10	500	—	
Thomas Waterworth	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
John Scholey	ditto	solicitor	10	500	—	
George Baker	Stamford	druggist	2	100	—	
T. J. Dafforn	ditto	grocer	2	100	—	
Francis Simpson & Son	ditto	soap-makers	2	100	—	
Timothy Lincoln	ditto	currier	2	100	—	James Gustard.
Henry Weldon	ditto	draper	3	150	—	
Charles Neale Fox	ditto	ironmonger	2	100	—	
C. White	ditto	druggist	4	200	—	
Joseph Phillips	ditto	brewer	6	300	—	
Robert Palmer	ditto	miller	5	250	—	
N. Rowe	ditto	grocer	3	150	—	
Richard Goodyer	ditto	saddler	1	50	—	
John Simpson	St. Martin's, Stamford-Baron.	innkeeper	2	100	—	
John Howes	Stamford	draper	2	100	—	
William Thomas Newzam	ditto	chemist & druggist.	5	250	—	
Orlando Edmonds, for the Stamford & Spalding Banking Company.	ditto	manager for the company.	10	500	—	
Orlando Edmonds	ditto	ditto	10	500	—	
William Cooke	8, Capel-court, S. E.	gentleman	20	1,000	—	Wm. Douglass, Market Harbro'.
John Clarke	Burton	woolstapler	10	500	—	
Elizabeth Stanley	18, Cumberland-st. Portman-square	spinster	4	200	—	John Gustard.
John Henry Wagstaff	122, Piccadilly	chemist & drug.	15	750	—	
M. & E. Levin	16, Great Alie-street	merchants	3	150	—	
Charles Gibbs	Market Harborough	innkeeper	8	400	—	
James Lovegrove	Dingley	gentleman	2	100	—	
Mary Norgate	ditto	spinster	2	100	—	Wm. Curling, Market Harbro'
William Lester	ditto	gardener	2	100	—	
Charles Goddard	Market Harborough	ironmonger	20	1,000	—	
John Waddingham	Gumley	steward	4	200	—	
William Ward	Smeeton	grocer	5	250	—	
Thomas Scriven	Northampton	gentleman	10	500	—	Wm. Scriven, Northampton.
Sam. Walker	Northampton	tailor	10	500	—	
John Dunkley	ditto	butcher	2	100	—	
John Elliott	ditto	builder	2	100	—	Wm. Scriven.
Theoph. Jeyes	ditto	solicitor	5	250	—	
Thomas Cooke	ditto	surgeon	4	200	—	
Thomas Heger	Notting-hill-terrace, Kensington.	gentleman	10	500	—	Wm. Douglass
Richard Lucas	Edith Weston, Rutland.	clerk	20	1,000	—	
Michael Bradford	Tickincote, near Stamford.	farmer	2	100	—	
Edward Sculthorpe	Water Newton, Huntingdonshire.	farmer	1	50	—	
John Trollope	Casewick, near Stamford.	baronet	20	1,000	—	James Gustar
Thomas Jelley	King's Cliffe, Northamptonshire.	miller	8	400	—	
Godfrey Jelly	Elton, Hunts	miller	6	300	—	
Thomas Standwell	Stamford	hotel-keeper	2	100	—	

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	ADDITION.	Number of Shares.	Sums Subscribed.	Seals.	WITNESS.
				£.		
William Landen Hopkinson	St. Martin's, Stamford-Baron.	physician	3	150	(L. S.)	
F. Jelly	Stamford	grocer	6	300	—	
James Richardson	ditto	builder	2	100	—	
Frederick Bowman	Duddington	gentleman	10	500	—	
Thomas Tryon	Bulwick	esquire	20	1,000	—	
Richard Newcomb	Stamford	printer	50	2,500	—	
William Parker	Northampton	boot and shoe manufacturer.	10	500	—	
William Stanton	Northampton	draper	3	150	—	
Miles Walker	Courtenhall	clerk	6	300	—	
Benjamin Bevan	Wellingborough	surveyor	10	500	—	
Richard Gallard	Towcester	druggist	6	300	—	
G. Baker	Northampton	gentleman	10	500	—	
William Cryen	Towcester	grocer	5	250	—	
Thomas Bland	Long Buckby	carrier	5	250	—	
Charles Bennett	Wicken	farmer	6	300	—	
Thomas Godfrey	Northampton	gentleman	5	250	—	
R. B. Portal	ditto	grocer	20	1,000	—	
R. Perceval	ditto	surgeon	5	250	—	
John Perry	ditto	miller	6	300	—	
Thomas Phipps	ditto	common brewer	5	250	—	James Gustard.
Cecilia Phipps	Haversham	widow	4	200	—	
Charles Hill	Wellingborough	esquire	5	250	—	
Lovell Hollis	Wilby	farmer	2	100	—	
John Turnell	Dallington	farmer	2	100	—	
William Gates	Northampton	gentleman	5	250	—	
Charles Markham	ditto	gentleman	5	250	—	
William Amifield	ditto	draper	5	250	—	
John Hensman	ditto	gentleman	5	250	—	
William Allen	ditto	gentleman	10	500	—	
John Whitmy	ditto	plumber	3	150	—	
D. Shrewsbury	ditto	wine-merchant	6	300	—	
Daniel Hewlett	ditto	gentleman	2	100	—	
Stacey Wise	Rush-mills, near Northampton.	paper-manufacturer.	5	250	—	
George Vials	Northampton	grocer	2	100	—	
George Cornfield	ditto	maltster	2	100	—	
H. L. Stockburn	ditto	merchant	10	500	—	
William Collins	ditto	yeoman	10	500	—	
Thomas Cox	ditto	innholder	5	250	—	
Charles Ireson	ditto	builder	5	250	—	
J. V. L. Crawley	Heyford	clerk	10	500	—	
Richard Worster	Long Buckby	grazier	10	500	—	
J. Abel	Northampton	bookseller	2	100	—	
William Symington	Market Harboro'	tea-dealer	10	500	—	William Douglass, Market Harborough.
John Payne	Harborough	horse-dealer	5	250	—	
Joseph Sharman	ditto	spirit-dealer	10	500	—	
Richard Gill	Barrowdon	merchant	5	250	—	James Torkington, jun., 13th Feb. 1837.
Stafford O'Brien	Blatherwycke	esquire	10	500	—	
Alexander Macdonald	Cotterstock	clerk	10	500	—	John Torkington, 14 Feb. 1837.
John Gustard, for Jonathan Sills Pidgcott.	Reading	gentleman	6	300	—	Wm. Douglass.
John Gustard, for Thomas Heathcock.	ditto	surgeon	10	500	—	
John Gustard, for Rowland Unwin.	Bexhill, Sussex	esquire	5	250	—	
John Gustard, for John Rainsford.	Ifley, near Oxford	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
		TOTAL	£.	605,200		

Appendix, No. 6.

A LIST OF PERSONS to whom Shares have been allotted, and the Number of Shares allotted to each.

NAMES.	RESIDENCES.	No. of Shares allotted.
Aychbourn, H. E.	38, Charles-st., Parliament-st.	20
Allen, Henry	80, Blackman-street, Borough	60
Armadio, Francesco	18, Red Cross-street, Barbican	50
Aloyse, J.	25, Archer-st., Camden Town	30
Amadio, Joseph	118, St. John-street-road	30
Allen, William	3, Druid's-pl., Peckham Rye	40
Bach, A.	42, Rupert-street, Haymarket	50
Brenan, E.	41, High Holborn	30
Baker, A.	2, Birchin-lane	10
Barwick, W.	4, Union-court, Old Broad-st.	10
Burrison, Henry	24, Pool-terrace, City-road	60
Bloxham, W. B.	40, Broad-street-buildings	25
Brakell, Elizabeth	8, Foster-lane, City	25
Burnett, William	96, Park-street, Regent's-park	20
Barnfield, W.	7, Sweeting's-alley, Royal Exchange	40
Browne, Thomas	11, Mark-lane	50
Blake, John T.	20, Queen-street, Tower-hill	25
Bannister, J.	5, Willow Cottages, Canonbury	15
Blakesley, Fred.	12, Paragon, New Kent-road	50
Bonsett, George	47, Aldermanbury	—
Buckland, Edw.	88, Union-street, Borough	60
Bryant, S.	7, Sweeting's-alley	50
Bell, R.	29, Bedford-square	50
Cox, George	4, Coleshill-street, Pimlico	20
Curling, Daniel	18, Cheapside	100
Crellin, James	4, St. James's-street	30
Cunningham, H.	4, Stafford-pl., South Pimlico	30
Chappe, George	42, Upper Thames-street	20
Crisp, Silons	35, Ranclagh-street, Pimlico	25
Cox, G.	46, Snow Fields, Borough	25
Cooper, Robert	5, Grove, Tollington-park, Hornsey	50
Cole, George	11, Mark-lane	50
Carmon, Nath.	16, Angel-ct., Throgmorton-st.	25
Clarick, Edward	67, Old Broad-street, London	30
Chamberlain, W. R.	21, Surrey-grove, Kent-road	30
Copeland, T. H.	14, Trinity-terrace, Southwark	20
Cooke, J. W.	8, Capel-court	25
Delholle, C. J.	12, Peckham-grove	25
Danger, F.	25, Charlotte-street, Fitzroy-sq.	50
Duthort, D.	6, Dyer's-court, Aldermanbury	50
Daniel, J. D.	67, Lombard-street	20
Druitt, Henry	ditto	50
Dimsdale, H. W.	Rosa Villa, Kilburn	100
Davison, A. J.	62, Leadenhall-street	30
Dickens, Geo. W.	25, Bishopsgate-street Within	30
Davison, Robert	4, Falcon-street, Falcon-square	20
Day, Benjamin	1, Monkwell-street, ditto	40
Day, Benjamin	ditto	10
Dickenson, John	18, Addle-st., Aldermanbury	30
Drew, John	37, Cleveland-st., Fitzroy-sq.	40
Dickenson, R. L.	21, King-street, Finsbury-sq.	30
Dolley, Charles	1, St. James's-street	50
Ellis, Henry	15, Bell-street, Paddington	5
Erck, W. A.	21, Lombard-street	30
Ellis, Frederick	Admiralty	60
Ellis, Edward	Secretary South Durham Railway	60
Elliott, C. F.	Haverstock-hill, Middlesex	10
Ellis, E. W.	26, Mortimer-st., Cavendish-sq.	50
Ellis	Admiralty	50
Eusten, John	10, Hart-street, Mark-lane	10
Fraser, Charles	John's Coffee-house, Cornhill	20
Farmer, P.	16, Charlotte-st., Blackfriars	50
Fowler, W. M.	At Messrs. Wolfer, brokers, 23, Change-alley	50
Filzgerald, James	201, Fleet-street	50
Firmkin, James	Stock Exchange	50
Fox, Thomas	3, Druid's-pl., Peckham Rye	20
Ford, Thomas	24, Retreat-place, Hackney	30
Fauncane, John	Stock Exchange	50
Griffiths, Charles	9, Myrtle-street, Hoxton	30
Goodman, George	21, Lombard-street	40
Groom, Jas. Edw.	12, Watling-street	20
Goodwin, Henry	13, London-lane, Hackney	40
Getting, John	46, Lime-street	20
Gustard, William	16, Bedford-street	30
Gordon, H.	1, King's Bench-walk, Temple	50
Gallerand, J.	Hammersmith	30
Godwin, T.	Stock Exchange	10
Green, T.	85, Aldersgate-street	50
Gerlach, John	27, Thomas-street, Hackney-rd.	60
Hills, Henry	At Chas. Edmonds', 9, Change-alley	40
Hoplay & Co.	28, Great Winchester-street	40
Harrison, Thomas	16, White-lion-street, Norton Falgate	25
Hendrikes, H.	2, Copthall Chambers	200
Harvey, Henry	Opposite Ship-tav., Tottenham	20
Hunt, W.	15, Addle-street, Aldermanbury	25
Hallpike, Richard	49, Jubilee-pl., Commercial-rd.	20
Hoys, W.	Mile End-road	20
Hall, Thomas	2, Arthur-st., East, London-br.	30
Hay, James	51, Newgate-street	100
Halse, J.	17, Exchange-buildings, Lond.	50
Howell, T. C.	Charlton, Kent	20
Heenan, Benjamin	39, Prince's-road, Kennington-common	30
Heath, William	3, Charlotte-row, Mansion-ho.	20
Hanley, W.	9, Calcutta-street	30
Hamilton, Wm.	56, Quadrant, Regent-street	100
Hewlett, Thomas	2, Luke-street, Finsbury	30
Halle, E.	16, Carburton-st., Portland-rd.	30
Huntley, Thomas	18, East-lane, Bermondsey	30
Jones, Stopford	Hambro'-whf., Upper Thames-street	50
Imrie, William	10, Woburn-place, Russell-sq.	50
Johnson, O. R.	Care Messrs. Carters & Co., 4, Aldermanbury	20
Irvine, R.	White Cottage, Montpelier, Walworth	25
Juckes, Jas. Aug.	Lincoln Chambers, Lincoln's Inn-fields	20
Issit, C. G.	85, Strand	20
Judson, T.	13, Newington Causeway	20
Jones, George D.	John's Coffee-house, Cornhill	40
Jessopp, Henry	58, Lincoln's Inn-fields	50
Jones, Robert	7, Hill-street, Walworth	30
King, R. M.	11, Windsor-place, City-road	20
Kendall, J.	7, Capel-ct., Bartholomew-lane	20
Kisch, Joseph	4, Broad-street-buildings	20
Kelly, Michael	30, Bankside	—
Lawrie, Edward	18, Nelson-square	50
Lawson, Robert	3, Bush-lane, Cannon-street	10
Lay, Benjamin	2, Langbourn Chambers, Fenchurch-street	20
Lewis, John	18, Lawrence Pountney-hill	25
Levinson, M.	66 & 67, London-wall	60
Largent, William	18, Cross-st., Newington-butts	20
Langley, Fred.	4, Taunton-place, Regent's-park	75
Lambert, Edward	3, Jewry-street, Aldgate	50
Lamb, Frederick	64, Rood-street, London	40
Lister, George	9, Hart-street, Bloomsbury	14
Levy, J. M.	44, Finsbury-square	30
Lawson, Richard	7, Sherborn-lane, Lombard-st.	30
Lunn, W.	74, Goswell-street	50
Lambert, W. L.	24, Queen-st. Northampton-sq.	30
M'Donald, James	Gravesend	25
Marsh, Edward	Bidborough-st., Burton-cresc.	20
Manning, Thomas	22, New Ormond-street	50
M'Nally, Richard	3, Walbrook	30
Macrone, J.	3, St. James's-square	50

NAMES.	RESIDENCES.	No. of Shares allotted.
M'Clean, Thomas	26, Haymarket	30
Milner, James	Arthur's Club, St. James's-st.	20
M'Arthur, J.	4, Beer-lane, Tower-street	50
Medina, H. A.	32, Fitzroy-square	60
Manly, Charles	28, Seething-lane, Tower-street	36
Maskell, J.	185, Kingsland-road	90
Marsden, Wm.	19, Maryland-pl., Gt. Bland-st.	20
Mackenzie, James	12, Great Winchester-street	50
Miller, John	Pitfield-street, Hoxton	10
Newcomb, Fran.	6, Doncaster-pl. Old Kent-road	20
Newberry, Henry	8, Foster-lane, nr. Post-office	30
Ord, J. W.	29, Northumberland-st., Strand	60
Ord, J. C.	172, Regent-street	100
Pitt, Alexander	3, York-street, Covent-garden	20
Parker, Thos. Hen.	Member of Stock Exchange	100
Pocock, John	3, Doddington-gro. Kennington	30
Pitt, S.	55, Drury-lane	20
Pitt, Joseph	15, Harpur-st., Red Lion-sq.	20
Paye, John	8, Bridge-street, Lambeth	35
Porter, H.	Suffolk-street, Pall Mall	30
Piercy, W. A.	7, Capel-court, Bank	30
Picard, L.	9, Marlboro'-street, Blackfriars	40
Poulton, B. H.	Staines-road, Hounslow	30
Plowman, James	39, Cleveland-st., Fitzroy-sq.	30
Pharazyn, H.	11, Lloyd's Gallery, Royal Exchange	30
Peach, J. H.	Rockingham-cottage, Shacklewell	20
Piercy, W. S.	Capel-court, Bank	10
Pellatt, John	5, Freeman's-court, Cornhill	30
Page, John	8, Bridge-street, Lambeth	100
Russa, P.	14, Charlotte-street, Blackfriars	20
Rickards, R.	9, Temple-place, Hackney-road	40
Risbie, W.	21, Lombard-street	10
Ricketts, J.	1, Heath-pl., Cambridge-heath	30
Ramsey, J.	2, Copthall-buildings	15
Reed, J.	20, Baker-street, Pentonville	50
Reed, J.	20, Baker-street, Pentonville	50
Railton, James	2, Queen-street, Islington	50
Robson, H.	Stock Exchange	30
Robson, John	3, Hamilton-place, New-road	50
Smith, Robert	1, New-court, Bow-lane	50
Scarborough, John	50, Bow-lane	50
Symonds, M.	19, Tottenham-road, Islington	—
Stevenson, B.	102, Cheapside	30
Stainforth, W.	26, Prince's-sq., Ratcliffe-highway	20
Sharman, Thos.	4, Seymour-pl., Barnsbury-park	30
Smith, Benj.	Laystall-st., Gray's-Inn-road	30
Sharp, Samuel	21, Lombard-street	20
Smith, R.	6, Barnsbury-ter., Liverpool-rd.	40
Salmon, Joseph	6, Clement's-Inn, Strand	25
Smethurst, Thos.	Stockwell, Surrey	50
Smethurst, Wm.	Knight's-pl., Wandsworth-rd.	50
Skene, Geo. R.	Addersey-lodge	100
Storer, C.	Liverpool-road, Islington	30
Simpson, W.	New-Inn, Strand	30
Smart, T. W.	47, Aldermanbury	30
Stinton, John	18, Throgmorton-street	25
Simpson, Edward	44, Poland-st., Oxford-street	50
Stanton, James	9, Haberdasher's-place, Hoxton	30
Smith, Daniel	16 & 17, Commercial-place, Commercial-road	40
Trevillian, John	4, Spanish-pl., Manchester-sq.	30
Temple, Wm.	2, Surrey-sq., Old Kent-road	30
Thompson, Chas.	2, Chatham-pl., Old Kent-road	75
Temple, Robert	18, Beaumont-square	25
Tompkins, Harry	3, Bartholomew-lane, and 2, Charles-place, Islington	50
Taylor, William	14, Barking-church-yard, Tower-street	30
Thomas, William	44, Farringdon-street, London	50
Turner, Thomas	92, Cornhill	20
Thick, Chas. Jas.	Copthall-buildings	30
Tonkin, N. H.	31, Cornhill	30
Thompson, Geo.	77, Leadenhall-street	30
Tullock, John	Bow, Middlesex	50
Terry, W. J.	111, Upper East Smithfield	20
Williams, C.	37, Old Broad-street	30
Watkinson, Joseph	Wannert-mills, Guilford	30
Wetman, John	51, Lime-street	40
Wilkins, John	Walcot-cottages, Hackney	50
Ward, Matthew	104, Upper Seymour-street, Euston-square	40
Weedon, James	Cursitor-street, Chancery-lane	15
Wetherell, G. & Co.	Cross-street, Finsbury	10
Williams, P.	20, Garnault-place, Spa Fields	30
Wood, J. M.	8, Golden-square	100
Wright, Fras.	Jun. United Service Club	50
Wetenhall, J. B.	19, Copthall-ct. Throgmorton-st.	20
White, Geo.	87, Wood-street, Cheapside	30
Williams, Robert	Care of Messrs. De Tastet & Co., Bishopsgate-church-yard, Lond.	30
Wilson, George	8, Foster-lane, Cheapside	30
White, W. W.	56, Lime-st., City	20
Wood, Robert	7, Capel-court, Bartholomew-la.	20
Wilton, George	183, Strand	20
Willson, Richard	14, Silver-street, Falcon-square	30
West, W.	6, Lambeth-square, Lambeth	50
Wood, Alfred	52, Crutched Friars	50
Wright, W.	16, Charlotte-st., Blackfriars-rd.	75
Williams, R. C.	Tollington-park, Hornsey, Mdx.	40
Young, Josh.	Church-cottage, York-gate, Regent's-park	100
Young, Alex.	Stock Exchange, & 9, Shorter's-ct.	50
Vincent, John	17, Southwark-sq., Southwark	20
Cater, J.	14, Old Jewry	50
Cater, J.	ditto	30
Sumner, J.	11, Lombard-street	25
Cleghorn, Josh.	ditto	25
Eck, T. V.	14, Paul's-terrace, Ball's-pond-gate	100
Jones, Geo.	Liverpool-road, Islington	30
Rolls, J.	94, Stamford-street	5
Wood, E.	London	10
Gompertz, Alex.	Tiverton-street, Newington	15
Gompertz, Alex.	ditto	25
Hamilton, Jno. W.	London	20
Coleman, John	20, Finsbury-place, Finsbury-sq.	2
Jones, John	South-place, Kennington-common	10
Franklin, Emanuel	Edinburgh	50
Franklin, Phineas	ditto	50
Watt, Peter	49, York-place, ditto	50
Rodgers, Will.	Belfast Gas Works, Ireland	6
Rodgers, Elizth.	Sleaford, Lincolnshire	2
Rodgers, Rebecca	ditto	2
Rodgers, Jane	ditto	2
Birkley Robert	Leicester	20
Ellis, John	ditto	20
Ellis, Josh.	ditto	20
Abbey, John	Harborough	20
Andrew, Wm., jun.	ditto	10
Andrew, Wm.	Olney	5
Andrew, Christiana	ditto	5
Abbott, Thomas	Harborough	10
Abbey, James	ditto	10
Addy, John	ditto	1
Buzzard, Wm.	ditto	10
Brooke, W. de Capel	ditto	20
Brooke, Sir A. de Capel	Oakley	50
Burdett, David	Harborough	2
Burdett, Sarah		2
Bennett, B. E.	Harborough, Marston Trussell	10
Burton, William	ditto	10
Bull, Josh.	ditto	2
Carr, William	ditto	10
Clarke, John	ditto	10
Clarke, Thomas	ditto	10
Clarke, George	ditto	10
Douglas, J. L.	ditto	20
Douglas, Clara	ditto	10
Flint, William	ditto	10
Falkner, Felix	ditto	5
Flavel, Thomas	ditto	10
Franklin, J. G.	ditto	10

NAMES.	RESIDENCES.	No. of Shares allotted.
Goddard, Holland	Harborough	25
Gatty, Henry	ditto	10
Goward, T. G.	ditto	10
Goddard, Charles	ditto	10
Gronow, M. B.	ditto	10
Gibbs, Charles	ditto	8
Gronow, S. H.	ditto	8
Hind, Thomas	ditto	10
Heygate, R. B.	ditto	15
Harris, F. A.	ditto	10
Holloway, W., sen.	ditto	10
Hubbard, Thomas	ditto	10
Goddard, James	ditto	20
Holloway, W., jun.	ditto	10
Harris, William	Guilsborough	2
Heygate, Thomas	Harborough	5
Kidman, James	ditto	5
Lester, William	Dingley	2
Lovegrove, James	ditto	2
Maine, Rev. J. T.	Bosworth	30
Newham, John	Harborough	10
Norgate, Mary	Dingley	2
Nunneley, John	Harborough	10
Nunneley, Josh.	ditto	5
Payne, John	ditto	5
Pywell, Thomas	ditto	5
Pickering, Josh.	ditto	5
Philips, Josh.	Leicester	10
Rogers, G. O.	Newport	20
Scott, Josh.	Harborough	10
Smith, William	ditto	10
Symington, Wm.	ditto	10
Sprigg, Miss A. R.	ditto	6
Sheppard, Wm.	ditto	10
Sharman, Joseph	ditto	10
Slater, William	ditto	5
Sulley, John	ditto	2
Seaton, Rowland	ditto	10
Sea, J. T.	ditto	10
Tomkinson, Chas.	ditto	5
Ward, William	ditto	12
Ward, William	Smeeton	5
Waddington, John	Grimley	4
Armstrong, R.	Laxton	1
Addy, Mihil, jun.	West Deeping	6
Bryan, John	Lyddington, Uppingham	5
Bryan, J. P.	Wakerley, Stamford	10
Baker, George	Stamford	2
Bowman, F., esq.	Duddington, Stamford	10
Bradford, Michael	Tickencote, Stamford	2
Cayley, Edw., esq.	Stamford	5
Carbery, Lord	Laxton Hall	10
Chadwick, Capt.	Stamford	2
Dafforn, Jno. Thos.	ditto	2
Eaton, C. A., Mrs.	Easton-house, Stamford	10
Fox, C. N.	Stamford	2
Guest, Lady Charlotte		20
Goodyer, Richard	ditto	1
Gill, R.	Barrowden, Stamford	5
Godfrey, Valentine	Duddington, Stamford	20
Hopkinson, Dr.	Stamford	3
Hotchkin, T., esq.	Tixover-house, Stamford	10
Humphry, Rd., esq.	ditto	10
Howes, John		2
Jackson, F. H., esq.	Stamford	6
Jelley, Francis	ditto	6
Jelley, Thomas	King's Cliff, Northamptonshire	8
Jelley, Godfrey	Elton, Hunts	6
Islip, John	Morcutt, Uppingham	3
Kemp, Fras.	Spalding	1
Lowe, John		2
Lowe, Charles	Stamford	6
Lincoln, Timothy	ditto	2
Lucas, Rev. Rich.	Edith Weston, Stamford	20
Mills, Thos., esq.	Stamford	10
Musson, William		2
M'Donald, Rev. A.	Cotterstock-hall, Oundle	10
Newcomb, Rich.	Stamford	50
Newzam, Wm. T.	Stamford	5
Nickolls, W.	Stamford	2
O'Bryan Stafford, esq.	Blatherwick-house, Stamford	10
Palmer, Robert		5
Phillips, Jos.		6
Rowe, William		3
Richardson, Jas.		2
Richardson, Sam. and Charles		1
Simpson, F. & Son	Stamford	2
Sculthorpe, C.	Water Newton, Wansford	1
Standwell, Thos.	Stamford	2
Simpson, John	Stamford	2
Stamford, Spalding and Boston Banking Company	Samford	10
Trollope, Sir J., bart.	Casewick-house, Uffington, Stamford	20
Tebbutt, Henry	Stamford	2
Torkington & Sons	Stamford	10
Tryon, Thos., esq.	Balwick-house, Wansford	20
White, Chamberlain	Stamford	4
Weldon, H., esq.	Stamford	3
Welsh, Edward	Greatford, Stamford	1
Warner, Thomas	Leicester	20
Edmonds, Orlando, esq.	Stamford	10
Abrahams, Phineas	Leeds	10
Abrahams, Phineas	Leeds	30
Anderson, James	Leeds	16
Alderson, George	Wakefield	10
Brady, Jarvis	Leeds	50
Beaumont, Rich.	Leeds	30
Baldwin, J. Barton	Leeds	20
Beckett, Isaac	Sheffield	4
Blackburn, John	Leeds	10
Coats, Joseph	ditto	6
Cardwell, Francis	Wakefield	10
Carter, Christopher Charles	Knaresbro'	40
Crosby, Benjamin	York	18
Charlton, John	Heslington, near York	10
Coward, Charles Leech	Sheffield	10
Crawford, William	Leeds	20
Dixon, Benjamin	Wakefield	10
Dawson, John	Leeds	6
Dunn, Henry	Wakefield	10
Dixon, Chas. M.	ditto	10
Dickenson, T. P.	Leeds	4
Dresser, John	ditto	4
Dobson, William	Malton	10
Fearne, Charles	Wakefield	20
Fowler, Samuel	York	20
Fowler, Thos. N.	ditto	20
Gourlay, Thomas	Bradford	10
Gatliff, Thomas	Heworth, near York	10
Gorell, R. A.	Bradford	4
Hope, James	Leeds	10
Haigh, jun., Dan.	Wakefield	10
Hudson, George	York	70
Holmes, Thomas	Bradford	10
Horne, Samuel	Goole	10
Hog, George	Leeds	20
Hudson, Robert	York	50
Harrison, George	Barnsley	30
Hall, Henry	York	10
Hope, James	Leeds	10
Hunt, jun., Wm.	ditto	10
Holforth, James	ditto	100
Horncastle, James	Holmfirth	10
Jackson, Charles Smith	Leeds	10

NAMES.	RESIDENCES.	No. of Shares allotted.
Lambert, James	Bradford	20
Mackkirk, Wm.	ditto	20
Mirfin, Richard	Leeds	50
Miller, M. H.	Scarborough	4
Nicholson, W. N.	Roundhay, near Leeds	100
Norris, Jas. Edw.	Halifax	50
Norris, Charles	ditto	50
Osburn, William	Leeds	10
Parnell, Geo. Thos.	ditto	6
Pitt, George	Barnsley	30
Pickering, R.	Malton	20
Potts, Radford	Leeds	10
Robinson, James	ditto	50
Ridsdale, jun. Jno.	ditto	50
Ridsdale, jun., H.	ditto	40
Ridsdale, George	ditto	20
Rand, John	Bradford	20
Rand, William	ditto	20
Robinson, Charles	York	20
Schlesinger, M.	Bradford	10
Smeeton, Edward	Leeds	20
Slack, Samuel	Bradford	20
Secker, William	Wakefield	10
Snow, John	ditto	10
Starkey, William	ditto	10
Simes, N. P.	Leeds	10
Sidney, Thomas	ditto	20
Scarth, James	ditto	50
Soulby, William	ditto	10
Smith, James	Wortley, near Leeds	10
Smeeton, Edward	Leeds	20
Singleton, Jon.	ditto	10
Tolson, John	Wakefield	10
Upton, jun., Thos. Everard	Leeds	4
Vickers, Edward	Sheffield	30
Watson, John	Leeds	50
Watson, Henry	York	20
Wood, jun., Joseph	ditto	20
Weatherhead, Rev. T.	Leeds	50
Wells, William	ditto	12
Waterworth, Thos.	Wakefield	10
Wilks, Chas. M.	Leeds	10
Woodall, Geo.	York	30
Watson, William	ditto	20
Wilson, George	Wakefield	10
Owen, J.	Sheffield	100
Owen, S., jun.	ditto	25
Brown, Thomas	Manchester	30
Branthwaite, Edw.	ditto	30
Buckley, Wm.	Ashton	60
Bury, George	Manchester	40
Brown, John	ditto	30
Broadbent, Thos.	Manchester	30
Baner, Abraham	ditto	10
Doncaster, Richd.	ditto	60
Doncaster, George	ditto	30
Evans, Thomas	ditto	20
Erskill, M.	ditto	30
Franklin, J. A.	ditto	20
Franklin, Isaac	ditto	20
Fox, Samuel	ditto	60
Franklin, Abm.	ditto	60
Gascghoine, Thos.	ditto	30
Green, Samuel	ditto	10
Gill, Robert	ditto	100
Goodyer, Wm.	ditto	30
Halle, Emanuel	ditto	20
Hime, Benjamin	ditto	30
Harrison, W. B.	ditto	20
Hyde, John	ditto	70
Hunt, John	ditto	20
Hime, Henry	ditto	20
Hamblacher, J. N.	ditto	30
Hethorn, John	ditto	60
Hiller, Harry	ditto	30
Harrison, John	ditto	10
Jacob, Morris	Manchester	30
Johnson, Thomas	ditto	10
Inton, Edwd. S.	ditto	30
Johnson, Samuel	ditto	30
Knight, Isaac	ditto	30
Leo, Herman E.	ditto	30
Molineaux, Thos.	ditto	30
Maguire, Joseph	ditto	60
Meyer, Samuel	ditto	30
M'Neale, Alex.	ditto	20
Pipe, William	ditto	30
Popplewell, F. A.	ditto	10
Roberts, Thomas	ditto	20
Royle, Edward	ditto	30
Roberts, Robert	ditto	10
Ryder, Thomas	Ashton	10
Randall, Cornelius	Manchester	100
Steinthall, Ludwig	ditto	30
Spencer, Samuel	ditto	30
Stones, John	ditto	30
Selby, Thomas	ditto	30
Strutton, M.	Chester	30
Stoby, William	Manchester	20
Scholes, George	ditto	60
Sichel, A. S.	ditto	50
Sparrow, John	ditto	10
Swallow, Charles	ditto	10
Schwind, Charles	ditto	30
Seed, Samuel	ditto	20
Sharp, Robert	ditto	100
Schwerin, Aug.	ditto	20
Twist, Bernard	ditto	20
Tuton, E. S.	ditto	30
Woods, Samuel	ditto	30
Wych, John	ditto	60
Wilkinson, David	ditto	10
Wilson, James	ditto	30
Wood, George	ditto	150
Walter, S. Lewin	ditto	60
Yearsley, William	ditto	30
Zanetta, Joseph	ditto	30
Harrop, John	Bank of Manchester	20
Parr, James	ditto	20
Broadbent, Thos.	Manchester	10
Wailes, John	ditto	12
Griffiths, John	ditto	5
Allender, William	Castle-street, Liverpool	5
Atkinson, G.	Water-street, ditto	15
Anderson, P.	Seacomb, near ditto	5
Atkinson, D. F.	Liverpool	10
Appleton, John	Byrom-street, ditto	5
Andrade, Joachim	67, Castle-street, ditto	10
Bentham, Christ.	Lord-street, ditto	25
Balfour, Rev. J.	Chester	15
Bezer, John C.	Liverpool	10
Baty, Thomas	Mount Pleasant, Liverpool	5
Bragg, Wm. B.	49, Grafton-street, ditto	10
Browne, N. E.	Liverpool	10
Boumphrey, Jas.	44, Falkner-street, ditto	10
Banner, Thomas	South John-street, ditto	20
Brown, Wm., jun.	India-buildings and Edge-hill, Liverpool	10
Bristowe, S.	Lord-street, Liverpool	10
Blundell, Edwd.	Great Homer-street, Everton, near Liverpool	10
Browne, William	St. Vincent-street, East, ditto	10
Browne, W., jun.	Edge-hill, Liverpool	10
Brend, William	Scotland-road, ditto	10
Berend, S.	Bold-street, ditto	25
Bradford, Edwd.	Dale-street, ditto	10
Cantrill, Henry	Preston Brook, Warrington	15
Critchley, Wm.	34, Mersey-street, Liverpool	25
Carson, James	8, Marylebone, ditto	10
Craven, George	Bridport-street, ditto	5
Clough, Robert	2, Mulberry-street, ditto	5
Cooke, Robert	Rumford-street, ditto	15
Collins, James	11, Norton-street, ditto	15
Court, Thomas	Sandon-street, Underwriters' Room, Liverpool	10

NAMES.	RESIDENCES.	No. of Shares allotted.
Crawford, James	Liverpool	15
Clarke, John	ditto	10
Carson, F. B.	Wood-street, Liverpool	10
Couran, Edward	Railway Company, ditto	10
Cooper, James R.	40, London-road, ditto	10
Cochrane, Wm. W.	Railway-yard, ditto	5
Daniel, Thomas	111, St. James's-st., ditto	10
Dignam, John	20, Harford-street, ditto	10
Dircks, Egbert	Edge-hill, ditto	20
Doncaster, G.	15, Great George-st., ditto	15
Dewhurst, J. G.	Lord-street, ditto	5
Dugdale, William	St. Ann's-street, ditto	15
Dobie, Charles	Gill-street, ditto	10
Ellwood, Daniel	Brindle Lodge, Preston	15
Everest, C. E., esq.	St. Ann's-street, Liverpool	20
Ellis, C. G.	Liverpool	15
Fairburn, A. C.	6, Mount Pleasant, ditto	15
Fell, John A.	Woodside, near ditto	10
Franks, George	Chester	5
Fairclough, G. F., esq.	West Derby-street, Liverpool	10
Found, John	3, Water-street, ditto	5
Firth, Thomas	Northwick, near ditto	25
Fowler, R., esq.	34, Water-street, ditto	10
Gibson, George	India-buildings, ditto	5
Gilton, Jno., esq.	West Derby, near Liverpool	15
Greens, Miss	Chester	10
Glover, Moses	Law-hill, Liverpool	10
Griffiths, John	Harrington-street, ditto	5
Green, Thomas	Regent's-road, Clarence-dock, L. P. Post-office, Liverpool	5
Grundy, J. H., esq.	Wood-street, ditto	10
Gerrard, Enoch	Chester	10
Garbell, E. W., esq.	Chester-street, Liverpool	10
Henton, John	Old Hall-street, ditto	15
Henton, Thomas	93, ditto - ditto	5
Hughes, Sarah	Old Hall-market, ditto	10
Hart, James	Atherton-buildings and Toxteth-park, ditto	10
Hamilton, R. H., esq.	Exchange ditto and West Derby, ditto	25
Hamilton, Jno. J., esq.	4, Tabley-street, ditto	25
Hamilton, W. S., esq.	ditto - ditto	25
Hamilton, Mary J.	ditto - ditto	25
Hime, Henry, esq.	Church-street, ditto	15
Hime, Edward	ditto, Seel-street, ditto	15
Henderson, Arthur	Priest-street, ditto	15
Healy, John	10, Edge Vale, ditto	10
Huddlestone, John	Great George-street, ditto	15
Hill, Thomas, jun.	30, Pleasant-street, ditto	5
Hind, Wm., esq.	Liverpool	20
Higgins, Wm., esq.	Temple-court, ditto	5
Jackson, Wm.	Tabley-street, ditto	15
Jones, Edward	Launcelot's Hay, ditto	10
Jackson, John S.	4, Tayley-street, ditto	20
Joseph, S., esq.	18, Temple-street, ditto	10
Jones, Thomas	Post-office, 3, Brook-sq., ditto	5
Jones, J. O., esq.	Castle-street, ditto	10
Jagger, Thomas	25, Warwick-street, ditto	10
Irvine, James	Chapel-street, ditto	20
Jones, John	Exchange-room, 14, Earl-st. ditto	10
Johnston, J.	18, King-street, Soho, ditto	5
Kincaird, Alex.	Liverpool	10
Kent, Edwd., esq.	Mason-street, ditto	15
Kaye, John, esq.	Dryden-street, ditto	10
Kennedy, John	Walnut-street, ditto	10
Kerr, Alex.	Woodside, near ditto	20
Leyland, Thomas	Brownlow-hill, ditto	10
Levy, Barnett	Lime-street, ditto	10
Lenox, Wm. C.	Dale-street, ditto	5
Lucy, Robert	35, Stafford-street, ditto	5
Lindon, W. J., esq.	Berry-street, ditto	10
Lawn, Robert	Excise, ditto	10
Leicester, Peter	Brunswick-street, ditto	10
Leicester, Thomas	ditto - ditto	10
Mellor, John	Great Oxford-street, ditto	15
Manifold, James	Covent Garden, Liverpool	5
Marshall, R., esq.	St. James-road, Wapping, ditto	10
M'Gloire, G.	Vernon-street, ditto	10
Milner, William	Erskine-street, ditto	40
Murray, C.	New Quay, ditto	10
Manlove, T. W., esq.	At Heywood's, ditto	10
Martindale, N.	Peter's-lane, ditto	10
Marshall, J., esq.	14, Duke-street, ditto	20
M'Morine, G., esq.	Drury-lane, ditto	10
Miller, Wm., esq.	8, Percy-street, ditto	10
Newsom, W.	Old Hall-street, ditto	25
Nathan, P.	25, Castle-street, ditto	5
O'Connell, M., esq.	John-street, ditto	20
O'Connell, M., esq.	- ditto - ditto	10
Overton, T. M., esq.	St. Ann-street, ditto	10
Owen, Charles	London-road, ditto	10
Price, Charles	Fairclough-street, ditto	5
Pickering, G.	Chester	15
Pearson, James	Nelson-street, Liverpool	10
Pearson, Mrs. M.	Nelson-street, St. James, ditto	5
Pearson, Hannah	ditto - ditto - ditto	5
Parlour, W., esq.	High-street, ditto	20
Pitts, George, esq.	Drury-lane, ditto	10
Palin, John	Chester	10
Reeves, R. D., esq.	Chapel-street, Liverpool	5
Robinson, George	7, Castle-street, ditto	20
Reckless, J., esq.	25, Berkeley-street, ditto	10
Roberts, E.	Drury-lane, ditto	5
Ralph, Andrew	10, Ranelagh-street, ditto	5
Radcliffe, John	New Haymarket, ditto	5
Redfern, John	Bedford-street, Harrington	5
Rowland, Samuel	Elliott-street, Liverpool	20
Read, Thomas	Castle-street, ditto	10
Stock, William	Dale-street, ditto	15
Schroeder, Henry	Exchange-street, East, ditto	15
Stevens, Thomas	Thornton-place, Toxteth-park, Wellington-road, ditto	10
Stretch, John	Exchange-street, East, ditto	10
Stephens, J. H., esq.	Everton	5
Stafford, Henry	Bridport-street, Liverpool	5
Sydney, George	Lord-street, ditto	20
Smith, W. A., esq.	44, King-street, ditto	20
Simmins, Daniel	3, Cleveland-square, ditto	10
Shaw, John, esq.	4, India-buildings, ditto	20
Staveley, R.	Manchester-terrace, ditto	10
Turner, William	Christian street, Islington, ditto	5
Tomlinson, W., esq.	Bank-buildings, ditto	15
Taylor, Charles	Hope-street, ditto	5
Towne, John	Upper Stanhope-street, ditto	10
Townley, C. J.	Water-street, ditto	15
Tweedie, Archd.	Trades Bank, ditto	10
Tetley, Thomas	Church-street, ditto	5
Townley, C. H., esq.	George-square, ditto	10
Troughlear, J. G., esq.	Great Homer-street, ditto	10
Taylor, William	66, Rose Gerrard-street, ditto	10
Unsworth, G. G.	Dale-street, ditto	5
Owen, J. Van, esq.	Gt. George-street, ditto	5
Vance, Patrick	India-buildings, ditto	25
Welch, S.	Gt. Oxford-st., Batham-st., ditto	5
Winstanley, S. T.	Church-street, ditto	5
Widdows, Edwd.	Gill-street, ditto	5
Watson, William	Berry-street, ditto	10
Wilson, Robt., esq.	Everton, ditto	5
Wright, Benjamin	Mill-street, ditto	10
Widdows, R.	Birkett-street, ditto	10
Woodward, J., esq.	King-street, Soho, ditto	10
Weber, P. E.	Scotland-road, ditto	10
Williams, John	4, Great George-street, ditto	5
Coglan, Thomas	Liverpool	10
Williams, Daniel	Windsor, ditto	20
Aspinal, John	Liverpool	50
Behrend, S. S.	Bold-street, Liverpool	50
Barclay, John	24, Pleasant-street, ditto	5
Bram, Henry	37, Soho-street, ditto	10
Cooke, Thomas	Liverpool	10
Cooke, William	Byrom-street, ditto	5
Collinson, Edwd.	174, Dale-street, ditto	15

(continued)

NAMES.	RESIDENCES.	No. of Shares allotted.
Croft, H.	Comus-street, Liverpool	20
Coleman, W. esq.	Christian-street, Everton, ditto	10
Franklin, Benj.	Liverpool	25
Franklin, Abraham	ditto	25
Franklin, Lewis	ditto	50
Fletcher, John	Toxteth-park, ditto	100
Grocott, John C.	18, Juvenal-street, ditto	10
Howell, Henry	3, Mersey-chambers, ditto	10
Hornby, Thomas	3, Moon-street, ditto	10
Hubblewhite, Thos. esq.	Church-street, ditto	25
Hastings, John	Lord-street, ditto	10
Humphreys, Jos.	13, Vernon-street, ditto	15
Jackson, John	99, Dale-street, ditto	10
Laing, Geo.	4, India-buildings, ditto	10
Lenox, Samuel	Canning-place, ditto	10
Lightfoot, Thomas	Everton, ditto	10
Lucas, Henry	Liverpool	10
Mossop, Joseph	Byron-street, ditto	10
Okill, William	177, Dale-street, ditto	10
Price, Richard	West Derby, ditto	10
Royle, William	68, Devon-street, ditto	10
Shallcross, Wm.	Much Woolton, ditto	10
Owen, Joshua Van esq.	Great George-street, ditto	5
Layland, John	Liverpool	50
Brownless, Wm.	ditto	40
Dodgson, Jonathan	21, Hanover-street, ditto	30
Ormerod, Peter	Douglas, Isle of Man, ditto	30
Houldsworth, Wm. esq.	11, Pan-street, Liverpool	25
Bright, Richard	Bold-street, ditto	40
Blake, John	ditto ditto	20
Robinson, R. S.	ditto ditto	20
Woolwright, John	ditto ditto	40
Radley, James	Ranelagh-place, ditto	20
Nicholson, Donald	Church-street, ditto	20
Smith, David	ditto ditto	20
Slater, W.	ditto ditto	40
Willmer, Edwd.	ditto ditto	20
Joseph Moss, esq.	Liverpool	17
Joseph B., esq.	ditto	17
Medder, Henry L.	Old Hall-street, ditto	10
Townsend, R. L.	St. Michaels, in ditto	10
Fowler, John	Hunter-street, ditto	10
Robinson, P.	King-street, Soho, ditto	5
Winstanley, S. & R.	Liverpool	10
Bond, W. A.	10, Pembroke-place, ditto	10
Leyland, W.	Liverpool	10
Stevens, Joseph	Park-road, ditto	20
Parr, Wm.	20, Whitechapel, ditto	5
Adnett, Joseph	Northampton	10
Adnett, Joseph, jun	ditto	14
Abbey, George	ditto	6
Ashby, Joseph	ditto	2
Atkins, James	ditto	6
Adkins, Chas. A.	ditto	10
Adkins, Jabez	ditto	6
Ashby, John	ditto	2
Barwell, Ewd. H.	ditto	20
Barry, G.	ditto	5
Barringer, John	ditto	2
Bacon, J. T.	ditto	2
Bartram, Robert	ditto	2
Berrill, W.	ditto	2
Brittell, John	ditto	5
Boyal, John B.	ditto	2
Britten, Charles	ditto	2
Cotton, Edward	ditto	20
Congreve, W. W.	ditto	5
Cooper, Joseph	ditto	10
Crick, Isaiah	ditto	4
Crick, Joseph	ditto	8
Cooke, George	ditto	6
Cooke, Edward	ditto	3
Clark, Benjamin	ditto	10
Dickens, Martin	ditto	2
Dadford, Jonathan	ditto	5
Dennis, Richard	Northampton	5
Dunkley, Wm.	ditto	5
Edens, Joel	ditto	5
Edens Mary	ditto	5
Freeman, John	ditto	10
Franklin, Wm.	ditto	6
Dadford, David	ditto	3
Grundy Thomas	ditto	10
Gourlay, David	ditto	2
For Greville, H. & E. signed Greville, H. M.	ditto	5
For Grome, J. and R. signed Richd. Groome	ditto	5
Hester, Gray	ditto	5
For Hewletts, T. B. and D. signed Hewlett, T. B.	ditto	10
Hewlett, T. B.	ditto	50
Harris, William	ditto	6
Hallam, Thos.	ditto	5
Hollis, Wm., jun.	ditto	5
Harvey, Robert	ditto	4
Higgins, J. K.	ditto	3
Hamson, John	St. James' end, ditto	4
Hesey, Samuel	Northampton	5
Hagger, Thomas	ditto	5
Hands, Thomas	ditto	4
Jayes, Phils.	ditto	2
Jones, John	ditto	10
Jee, Elizabeth	ditto	5
Jacob, Henry	ditto	2
King, William	ditto	2
Kilpin, J. P.	ditto	2
Kightley, John	ditto	5
Muddiman, Wm.	ditto	4
Mayor, Edward L.	ditto	5
Mackness, James	ditto	5
Macquire, John	ditto	2
Osborne, George	ditto	20
Osborne, Thomas	ditto	10
Percival, Samuel	ditto	25
Phipps, John	ditto	10
Percival, John	ditto	25
Phipps, Richard	ditto	10
Porter, William	ditto	22
Percival, J. jun.	ditto	10
Peach, George	ditto	5
For Parsons and Chenell, signed Henry Parsons	ditto	2
Pressland, T.	ditto	3
Peach, Samuel	ditto	5
For Powell, M. & E. signed Powell, Elizabeth	ditto	2
Penn, J. D.	ditto	2
Roe, William	ditto	6
Rice, Samuel	ditto	10
Robertson, A.	ditto	6
Richardson, Thos.	ditto	10
Sharp, Thomas	ditto	10
Stanton, Edwd.	ditto	12
Strong, William	Hardingstone, near Northampton	14
Smith, Thomas	ditto	2
Sutton, W.	ditto	10
Stevenson, J., sen.	ditto	5
Stanton, Samuel	ditto	10
Stringer, James	ditto	5
Shaw, Thomas	ditto	10
Terry, H.	ditto	10
Williams, Wm.	ditto	10
Whitworth, H. B.	ditto	10
Wilkinson, David	ditto	10
Wheeler, Thomas	ditto	6
Willson, Esther	Cotton End, near Northampton	20

(continued)

NAMES.	RESIDENCES.	No. of Shares allotted.	NAMES.	RESIDENCES.	No of Shares allotted.
Walker, Samuel	Cotton End, Northampton	5	Rands, George	Northampton	5
Parker, William	ditto	10	Elliott, John	ditto	2
Stanton, William	ditto	3	Scriven, Richard	Castle Ashby, near ditto	1
Walker, Miles	Courtenhall, in ditto	6	Worster, Richard	Long Buckby, near ditto	10
Bevan, Benjamin	Wellingborough, ditto	10	Goosey, Thomas	ditto	2
Gallard, Richard	Towcester	6	Becke, Henry	ditto	6
Baker, George	Northampton	10	Nagus, John	ditto	2
Cryer, William	Towcester, in ditto	5	Kerr, Doctor	ditto	16
Bland, Thomas	Long Buckley, in ditto	5	Wetherell, M.	ditto	3
Bennett, Charles	Wicken	6	Bailey, Thomas	Hardingstone, near ditto	1
Godfrey, Thomas	Northampton	5	Steevenson, B.	ditto	5
Portal, R. B.	ditto	20	Armfield, B.	ditto	5
Percival, William	ditto	5	Weston, Joseph	Brixworth, near ditto	4
Perry, John	ditto	6	Boswonk, T. W.	Creaton, near ditto	5
Phipps, Thomas	ditto	5	Weston, E.	Brixworth, near ditto	10
Phipps, Cecilia	Haversham, ditto	4	Weston, H.	ditto	10
Hill, Charles	Wellingborough, ditto	5	Cooke, Thomas	ditto	4
Hollis, Lovell	Wilby, ditto	2	Drinkley, J., sen.	ditto	2
Turnell, John	Dallington, ditto	2	Campion, J. N.	ditto	1
Gales, William	Northampton	5	Hamson, Joseph	ditto	2
Markham, Charles	ditto	5	Rice, James	ditto	10
Armfield, William	ditto	5	Jeyes, T.	ditto	5
Hensman, John	ditto	5	Abel, J.	ditto	2
Allen, William	ditto	10	Whiting, James	ditto	6
Whiting, John	ditto	3	Grafton, John	Cambridge	50
Shrewsbury, David	ditto	6	Heathcock, T.	Reading, Berkshire	10
Hewlett, Daniel	ditto	2	Pidgcott, J. F.	ditto	6
Wise, Stacey	Rush Mills, in ditto	5	Sleeman, J.	ditto	6
Vials, George	ditto	2	Unwin, Rowland	Bexhill, Battle, Sussex	5
Cornfield, George	ditto	2	Burgess, Wm.	Watford, Hertfordshire	10
Stockbun, H. L.	ditto	10	Shrapnell, J. C.	Bristol	10
Collens, William	ditto	10	Rainsford J.	Iffler, near Oxford	30
Cox, Thomas	ditto	5	Stanley, Mrs. E.	18, Cumberland-pl., Portman-sq.	4
Ireson, Charles	ditto	5	Lever, N.	16, Great Haley-street, Goodman's-fields	4
Crawley, J. L. L.	ditto	10			
Scriven, Thomas	ditto	10	Wagstaff, J. H.	122, Piccadilly	15
Bull, John	Northampton	2	Raynsford, J.	Iffler, near Oxford	30
Richards, William	ditto	5	Heger, Thomas	21, Nottinghill-terrace	10

Appendix, No. 7.

SOUTH MIDLAND COUNTIES RAILWAY.

RETURNS to the ORDER of the COMMITTEE of the 5th May 1837.

No. 7. Returns to the Order of the Committee, 5th May 1837.

1. A printed copy of the Bill accompanies this Return.

2. Copies of the deed of settlement and parliamentary contract are also left herewith.

3. Copies of the resolutions entered into at the public meeting held at Harborough on the 1st of March 1836, when the formation of the company was determined upon; of the prospectus issued pursuant thereto on or about the 13th March 1836, and of a statement published in the month of December 1836, showing the then position and prospects of the company; of the resolution entered into at the public meeting held at Northampton in January 1837, when the Marquis of Northampton presided; of the resolutions entered into at the public meeting held at Stamford in January last, when Sir John Trollope, bart., presided; and at Harborough in January last, when R. H. Heygate, esq. presided, are also delivered in.

4. An advertisement appeared in the Times newspaper of the 4th of April 1836 and some preceding days, and other London papers, stating that application for shares must be made before the 6th April 1836, and a reference given as to the respectability, &c. of the applicants.

Advertisements appeared in the Times and other London papers stating that the deeds would remain for signature at the office at Charing-cross, from the 25th to the 30th April 1836.

5. The number of persons who made written applications for shares, residing in London alone, was 1,256. The amount of shares applied for by these persons was 41,730; in money 2,086,500 *l.* The number of persons who applied for shares in Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Northampton, Harborough, Stamford, and other places in the county cannot be correctly ascertained, but from the number of persons resident in these places, to whom shares were subsequently allotted, and who have signed the deeds and paid their deposits, and from the

 letters

No. 7.
Returns to the Order of the Committee, 5th May 1837.

letters of the agents at these places, they must have exceeded 600. The amount in shares 12,000 *l.*, and in money 600,000 *l.*

Mr. Thomas Coglan, stockbroker and general agent at Liverpool, was authorized by the directors to make an allotment of 2,000 shares amongst the most respectable applicants at Liverpool; Messrs. Redesdale, stockbrokers at Leeds, in the same manner, and to the same amount, amongst the applicants at and in the neighbourhood of Leeds; and Mr. David Holt, stockbroker, Manchester, in the same manner, and to the same amount, amongst the applicants at Manchester.

The bankers mentioned in the first prospectus had, at the formation of the company, authority to allot shares at their discretion to applicants in their immediate neighbourhood; but this authority was revoked on the 13th of April 1836.

Prior to the 13th April 1836, allotments were made to London applicants by the directors at their different meetings; but on that day Messrs. Nunneley, Mills, and Godfrey, three members of the directory, were appointed as a sub-committee to make a selection from the applicants to whom further shares were to be allotted.

6. The number of shares that were allotted is 18,914, and the number of persons to whom such shares were allotted is 968.

7. A list of persons to whom shares have been allotted, and the number of shares allotted to each person, accompanies this Return.

8. The number of shares on which deposits had been paid prior to the 18th of August 1836, when the accounts were last audited, and since which time no Return has been made by the country bankers, is 13,058 *l.*, and the number of depositors 738.

9. A list of the depositors up to the 18th of August 1836, with the amount of their respective deposits, accompanies this Return.

10. The number of shares subscribed for on the parliamentry contract is 12,124, and the number of subscribers is 607.

11. Of the 607 persons who have signed the parliamentary contract, 561 had shares originally allotted to them; the remaining 46 are almost all residents in London, and were transferrers or purchasers of the bankers' receipts, and they exchanged such receipts for scrip at the time they signed the parliamentary contract.

FIFTH REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

RAILWAY SUBSCRIPTION LISTS;

TOGETHER WITH THE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

Direct London and Brighton Railway.

(RENNIE'S LINE.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
14 *July* 1837.

Mercurii, 22° die Februarii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the matters of several Petitions, complaining of the Names of certain needy and indigent Persons having been inserted in the Subscription Lists of several Railways, and praying for Inquiry into the Case of the Deptford and Dover Railway Subscription List; and to whom several Petitions containing similar allegations were particularly referred.

Martis, 1° die Martii, 1837.

A Committee was nominated of,—

Mr. Warburton.
Mr. Dugdale.
Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Aaron Chapman.
Mr. Charles Lushington.
Sir Eardley Wilmot.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. John Young.
Mr. Daniel Gaskell.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. George Evans.

Ordered, THAT the said Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers and Records.

Ordered, THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Mercurii, 19° die Aprilis, 1837.

Order [1st March] that Five be the Quorum of the Committee, read, and discharged.

Ordered, THAT Three be the Quorum of the said Committee.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to report their Opinion, together with the Minutes of the Evidence taken before them, from time to time, to The House.

Veneris, 21° die Aprilis, 1837.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Dugdale, Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. John Young and Mr. George Evans be discharged from further attendance; and that Mr. Chalmers be added to the Committee.

THE REPORT - - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - p. 1
APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - p. 179

FIFTH REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE to whom have been referred sundry Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contracts of certain Railway Companies, and, among these, the following Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contract of the Direct London and Brighton Railway Company, viz.

1. That of Henry Cooke, late of Grove-place, Holloway, Stock-jobber, and now a prisoner in Whitecross-street Prison, stating that he signed the said Contract of the said Railway Company, for 225 shares, whereof 125 shares so signed for were the property of one J. Whittan, of the Stock Exchange, who paid the Petitioner 2 *l.* for so doing; and 100 shares so signed for were the property of one R. Huckvale, of the Stock Exchange, who paid the Petitioner 30 *s.* for so doing:

2. That of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, of Belinda-street, Canonbury-square, Gentleman, stating, among other things, that he was applied to in January last, by one Samuel Carr, of the Stock Exchange, to sign the said Contract of the said Railway Company, the said Carr promising to pay the Petitioner for so doing; that, in consequence of this application, the Petitioner, at the said Company's office, signed for a number of shares, which one Vale (as he believes), of the Stock Exchange, there handed to him, amounting in money to 38,750 *l.*; and that the Petitioner received a sovereign from the said Carr for so signing:

3. That of certain Members of the Provisional Committee, and of the Solicitors and Secretary of the said Railway Company, solemnly asseverring, amongst other things, that the said Contract of the said Railway Company was got up and signed in the most fair, open and impartial manner; that the Subscription List is a *bonâ fide* one; and that neither they, nor any other Person or Persons on their behalf, or with their consent or knowledge, or acting under their authority, directly or indirectly, gave any premium or other consideration, or promise to any Person or Persons to sign the said Contract; and praying that as, under the Standing Orders of the House, it is the duty of the Committee to which Bills are referred, to report specially on the validity or sufficiency of the Parliamentary Contracts, the Committee to which the Brighton Railway Bills are referred, may be specially instructed to examine into the circumstances respecting the signing of the said Company's Contract:

4. That of Richard Lill, Secretary to the Provisional Committee for Stephenson's Line of Railway, informing the House that he has examined the List of Subscribers to the Parliamentary Contract of Rennie's Line, and stating several facts regarding Henry Cooke, the Petitioner first above-

above-mentioned, and respecting the Father of the said Henry Cooke, William Cooke, who is also a Subscriber to the said Contract; and also respecting Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, the Petitioner second above-mentioned; and also respecting one Samuel Carr, who is a Subscriber on the said Contract for 107,550 *l.*, and is stated by the Petitioner to have received money as consideration for signing; and also respecting certain other Subscribers to said Contract; and praying that the House will cause the alleged facts to be inquired into:

5. That of James Slatford Vale, of the Stock Exchange, Stockbroker, denying that he is the person referred to in the above Petition of the above-mentioned Benjamin Wheeler Poulton:

6. That of Daniel Edward Stephens, of Chingford, Gentleman, stating that he is the holder of 20 Shares in Rennie's Line; and has examined the List of Subscribers to the Contract of the said Company; and stating certain facts respecting certain Subscribers to the said Contract for large amounts; and praying that the House will cause the same to be inquired into:

7. That of Samuel Carr, of 27, Half-moon-crescent, Pentonville, Gentleman, admitting that he was employed by Mr. Huckvale, of the Stock Exchange, to sign the said Contract for 1,829 Shares, and that he signed himself for 1,319 Shares, and employed Benjamin Wheeler Poulton to sign for the remaining 510 shares; and that he received from Mr. Huckvale a remuneration for so doing; and stating that the said transactions were done without the privity of the said Company, their Solicitor, Secretary, Agent, or any of them; and praying that if in the premises the Petitioner has acted wrong, he alone may incur blame:

8. That of Richard Blackmore, of Trafalgar-place West, Hackney-road, stating that when he signed the said Contract of the said Railway Company, he was the *bonâ fide* holder, on his own account, of the Shares for which he signed, and denying that he was paid any consideration for so signing, and further denying that he is in very distressed circumstances:

9. That of John Haley, of White's-row, Mile-end, stating that when he signed the said Contract of the said Railway Company, he was the *bonâ fide* holder of the Shares he signed for, and denying that he signed for any other person, or was paid any consideration for so signing:

10. That of William Cooke, of Keppel-row, Stoke Newington-green, admitting that he signed the said Contract of the said Railway Company for 182 Shares at the request and on the behalf of his son; from whom he did not receive on that account any remuneration; and stating that in so doing he was not aware that he was infringing the Rules of the House; and that the said Company or their officers were not aware that the Petitioner was not the real and *bonâ fide* holder of the said Shares when he so signed for them:

11. That of George Walker, of Old 'Change, admitting that he signed the said Contract of the said Railway Company for 35 Shares, by the direction and on the behalf of Mr. Joseph Thompson, of Old 'Change, to whom the said Shares belonged; and from whom he did not receive on that account any remuneration; and stating that in so doing he was

was not aware that he was infringing the Rules of the House; and that the said Company or their officers were not aware that the said Shares were not the property of the Petitioner; and praying that if he acted wrong in the premises, he alone may bear the consequences:

12. That of Robert Huckvale, James Whittan and Edward Frith, members of the Stock Exchange, and dealers in shares of various Railway Companies, stating that in January last they were holders of a large number of Shares in the said Direct London and Brighton Railway Company; that notice was given by the said Company of a further call of 1*l.* per share, upon payment of which call, and on the signing of the Parliamentary Contract, and on the surrender to the Company of the old Shares, new Shares were to be delivered to the parties; but in the event of nonpayment of which call, and of the signing of the Parliamentary Contract by a certain day, the old Shares were to become void: that they being holders of old Shares, and being desirous of exchanging the same for new Shares, but being unwilling to sign any deed, or incur any risk, except that of the fluctuation of the market, entered into an arrangement with Samuel Carr and Henry Cooke, who at that time were members of the Stock Exchange, that the Petitioners should deliver to the said Carr and Cooke old Shares in exchange for new Shares, on which the said call of 1*l.* was to be paid, and for which the Petitioners were willing to pay a premium: that they therefore delivered to the said Carr and Cooke several hundred old Shares, together with the deposit money required to be paid thereon, on the understanding that new Shares to a like amount were to be delivered to them, and that the premium agreed upon was paid on such delivery: that neither the Directors nor any of the officers or agents of the said Company were aware of the nature of the interest that the said Carr and Cooke had in the said Shares; nor even had they been so, do the Petitioners believe that the Directors could have refused to allow the said Carr and Cooke, on their paying the said call, to sign the Deed, pursuant to the advertisement: that the Petitioners did not consider that in the transactions stated they were doing anything wrong, or infringing any rule of the House: that if in the premises they have acted wrong or against the Rules of the House, they exceedingly regret it; and declare that they believe neither the Directors, nor the officers nor agents of the Company, nor any of them, were in any way cognizant of the matters stated in their Petition.

13. That of Joseph Thompson, of Old 'Change, Calico-printer, stating that he was induced to instruct the above-named Petitioner, George Walker, who is in the employ of the said Joseph Thompson, to sign the Deed for 35 Shares, because he did not wish his name to appear in the Parliamentary Contract of the said Company for any greater number of Shares than the 25 which he originally held; that he is ready and willing to substitute his name for that of the said George Walker, as the holder of the said 35 shares, and to pay the calls that may be made in respect of them, and to indemnify George Walker for signing the Deed; that in the said transaction the Petitioner was not aware that he was acting wrong, or infringing the Rules of the House; that

if he has done so, he exceedingly regrets it, and distinctly declares that neither the Directors, nor the Officers nor Agents of the Company, nor any of them, were cognizant of the matters stated in his Petition:

And who were empowered to report their observations, together with the MINUTES OF EVIDENCE taken before them from time to time, to The House;——HAVE taken Evidence on the Matters adverted to in the said Petitions, or having reference thereto, and have heard the observations made on such Evidence by the Counsel for the Petitioners third and fourth abovementioned; and after considering the whole of the premises, have agreed to the following REPORT:

THE project for the formation of a Company to obtain an Act for making a Line of Railway, to be called the Direct London and Brighton Railway, from the London and Croydon Railway to Brighton, with branches to Shoreham, Newhaven, Lewes and Hove, was set on foot in the beginning
16066. of the year 1836. In the prospectus issued on the 1st of February in that year, containing the names of the Provisional Committee, secretary, engineer, solicitors and bankers, and setting forth the advantages of the proposed
16070, 16071, 16072. Undertaking, the capital required was estimated at 800,000 *l.*, to be raised in 16,000 shares, of 50 *l.* each, the deposit to be 2 *l.* per share; and persons desirous of subscribing were directed to apply for shares to the Provisional Committee, according to a form of application appended to the prospectus, containing a promise to pay the deposit, and to sign the Parliamentary Contract and Subscribers' Agreement for such shares as should be allotted to
16177 them. In the Bill for the formation of this Company, in the last Session of
20871. Parliament, the proposed capital was increased to 900,000 *l.*; but no shares
20834 to 20842. were ever issued on the additional capital. The applicants, who were in
20858. number 1,281, applied for 44,802 shares. The Provisional Committee,
20834 to 20842. assisted by their solicitor, allotted the shares: in the first instance, to the public 10,969, and to the Directors 1,396 shares; but afterwards, to the public 11,692, and to the Directors 4,308 shares; in total 16,000 shares to
16221, 16222. 20309. 401 allottees. None but original allottees were allowed to sign the Deed. Including repetitions of the same name, there were 396 persons who signed the Deed, who subscribed for and paid deposits on 15,985 shares, amounting
16160. in money to 797,250 *l.*, on which the deposits amounted to 31,970 *l.* The mode of issuing certificates for shares was the following:

16092. The Deed was left at the bankers' from the 12th to the 14th of February.
16104 to 16107. 16084. A party applying at the bankers' was required to produce his letter of allotment, and on paying his deposit, and signing the Deed, was furnished with a bankers' receipt. The bearer of a bankers' receipt, on presenting the same to the Secretary at the Company's office, received his certificates for
16082. shares; a bankers' receipt might therefore have passed through many hands before it was exchanged for shares.

The Committee, of the Session of 1836, on the Bills for the competing Lines of Railway from London to Brighton, reported against the Direct Line, and in favour of Stephenson's. The Directors, however, of the Company for the Direct Line, renewed their opposition to Stephenson's Line (as by the conditions of their Subscribers' Agreement they were empowered to do), before the Lords' Committee on Stephenson's Bill; where that Bill also was lost. The result of this contest at the end of the last Session of Parliament was,
16118 to 16120. that the present Company had incurred an expense of about 40,000 *l.*, which exceeded

exceeded the amount of the deposit Fund by a sum of about 8,000*l.* Before a new series of measures, preparatory to a new Session of Parliament, was entered upon, the different professional men, who had been employed by the Company in the preceding Session, exclusive of the Counsel, agreed to receive the residue of the original deposit money in full of all their then unliquidated claims. 20757.

The measures to be taken for renewing the application to Parliament in the present Session for obtaining an Act for the Direct Line of Railway to Brighton were agreed to at a meeting of Subscribers, convened by public advertisement, and held at the London Tavern on the 18th of October 1836, at which meeting, including the Directors, all of whom are stated to have attended, from 130 to 150 persons were present. 16167. 20819.

At this meeting it was resolved, that the capital of the Company should be increased from 800,000*l.* to 1,200,000*l.*, by converting every 50*l.* share into a 75*l.* share; that a call of 2*l.* should be made on each share, to be paid at such time or times as the Directors might appoint; and the Directors were empowered to take all such means in relation to the renewed application to Parliament, as they should think proper; to carry which resolutions the meeting were empowered by the 12th and 13th clauses of the original Subscribers' Agreement. Pursuant to the foregoing resolutions, the Directors gave notice, by public advertisement, on the 21st of October 1836, requiring the subscribers to pay, between the 12th and 15th of November, a moiety of the above call of 2*l.*, namely, 1*l.* per share, into the hands of the bankers named in that advertisement; who, on the Subscribers signing a new Parliamentary Contract and a new Subscribers' Agreement, to be left at the bankers' for that purpose, were authorized, it was further stated, to give receipts for the deposits that might be paid. It was further announced in the advertisement, that all shares on which the above-mentioned payment should not be made within the above time limited, would become forfeited. Forfeiture of shares, however, as a penalty to be incurred for the nonpayment of any additional call agreed to at a general meeting of subscribers, is not authorized by the 13th clause of the Subscribers' Agreement, which empowers such a meeting to make additional calls; it may therefore be doubted whether the Directors were empowered to enforce such a forfeiture. Pursuant to the last-mentioned advertisement, a new Parliamentary Contract and a new Subscribers' Agreement were prepared, and left at the bankers'. The old certificates for shares were now to be called in, and new certificates were to be issued. 20885. 20887.

This was effected in the following manner:

To any party whatsoever, on his paying a sum of money to the bankers, and thereupon signing the Deed and Subscribers' Agreement, a receipt was given for a corresponding amount. Any bearer of such a receipt, who either previously might happen to be, or by purchase or otherwise might afterwards become the holder of old shares, agreeing in number with the number of pounds specified in this receipt, was, on presenting his old shares and his receipt at the office of the Company, entitled to receive new shares, or scrip certificates as they are called, to a corresponding amount. 16256, 16257. 21154. 16258.

To the 15th of November inclusive, only 2,353 shares were subscribed for at the bankers' in town and country. 20671.

After the 15th of November the Deed was removed to the office of the Company; and from that time until the 18th of January, continued to be 16699.

signed by any person producing old certificates, and offering to pay deposits to a corresponding amount at that office.

Of the parties who signed after the 15th of November, several were permitted to do so as a matter of indulgence, on lodging their old certificates at the office, without previously paying their deposits. From the 16th of
20671. November to the 11th of January inclusive, only 3,433 more shares, making altogether 5,786, having been brought in and subscribed for, an advertise-
20376. ment was issued, announcing that no old scrip would be received in exchange for new after Wednesday the 18th of January, from which time the old scrip would, by default of the holders, become null and void. From
20671. the 12th to the 18th of January inclusive, 4,873 more shares were brought in
20903. and subscribed for, making altogether 10,659.

20376. In special cases, subsequently to the 18th of January, even down to so late a date as the 20th of April, the Directors have allowed old certificates to be exchanged for new. Under these are comprehended about 2,560 shares, which they permitted to be exchanged from the 19th of January to the 2d of February inclusive; making the total subscribed to the 2d of February, the day on which the deed was deposited in the Private Bill Office, 13,219
Subscription List. shares, in monied amount, 991,425 *l.* subscribed by 236 persons, including therein those names which appear more than once on the Subscription List.

20402. The number of subscribers who on the same day had paid their deposits, was 216, and the number of shares on which the deposits were paid, was
20401. 20671. 10,300. The shares subscribed for to the 22d of May last inclusive, were 14,817 in number, amounting in money to 1,111,275 *l.*, of which sum the subscribers were 220 in number; which left a balance of 1,183 shares, or 88,725 *l.*, to complete the entire capital. Of the 396 subscribers to the Deed of 1836, only 50 were subscribers to the Deed of 1837. They subscribed on the old Deed for 6,324 shares, 316,200 *l.*; and have subscribed on the new Deed for 6,405 shares, 480,375 *l.* The old shares not brought in to be exchanged, which, on the 18th of January, were 5,326 in number, have, by indulgence granted in special cases, been since reduced to 3,183. The Directors deeming it, as they state, an object of importance to fill up the Subscription List, considered these shares to have been forfeited, and on the 28th of January agreed to divide 2,150 of these, amounting in money to 161,100 *l.*,
16635. subject to the liability of making good the new deposit, among certain mem-
20495 to 20497. bers of their own Board. These Directors are the only parties who obtained
16625. new certificates without bringing in old certificates.

16292. 16295. 20932. When parties presented themselves to sign the new Deed, no inquiry whatever was made who the parties were. Mr. Dean, the Secretary, states that he never took into consideration how juvenile the appearance, or
20929, 20930. how large the subscription of a party claiming to sign was. He did not feel
20443, 20444. himself in a situation to refuse any such claimant, nor authorized to question him as to his conduct, his age, or the genuineness of his subscription. For
20904. 20907. the Directors, he states, were advised that any holder of old shares, offering to deposit 1 *l.* per share, and to sign the Deed, was entitled as of right, on making the claim, to receive new shares in exchange for the old ones he presented; and that the Company would not have the power to sustain a refusal. The original Subscribers' Agreement is wholly silent respecting the transfer or assignment of the shares of subscribers previous to the obtaining of an Act of Parliament. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that an original

original subscriber, or a *bonâ fide* transferree of the shares of an original subscriber, in however poor a condition of life such a person might be, might have compelled the Directors to allow him to exchange his old shares for new ones, this could not possibly apply to minors, who, by signing the Deed, would not incur any pecuniary responsibility; nor to parties signing the Deed in their own name, without having a beneficial interest in the shares for which they signed.

Mr. Dean himself admits, that in the case of certain parties who applied to sign (but not under power of attorney) for certain other parties, he refused to receive the signatures, stating that no one to whom the shares did not belong, could, on behalf of another to whom they did belong, except under a sealed power of attorney, sign the Deed; which itself was a sealed instrument. And Mr. Dean further states, that he would not have allowed any person to sign, who admitted that he came to sign for another. 21043, 21044. 20446.

The consequence of allowing parties, without putting to them any question, or making any inquiry who they were, to sign the Deed, has been, that many jobbers in shares, and others who wish to carry on this kind of traffic without incurring the liabilities to which the subscription of deeds might subject them, have employed a number of persons, some of very insufficient pecuniary responsibility, others from their being minors, insolvents or in most indigent circumstances, of no pecuniary responsibility whatever, as their fit instruments to sign for shares in this Company.

The names of those parties whom Your Committee are disposed to regard as not *bonâ fide* subscribers, they have inserted in a Table, with the amounts of their respective subscriptions against their names, stating on what grounds objection lies to them as subscribers: whether, 1, That they signed for others, without stating that fact on the Deed itself: 2, That they signed for others, without stating that fact on the Deed itself, and also for a pecuniary compensation: 3, That they were minors when they signed: 4, That they do not possess sufficient means to meet the payments on the shares as they may fall due: 5, That they signed other Deeds for other parties, without stating the fact on the Deed itself, and for a pecuniary compensation.

	Signed for another.	Signed for another, and for Money.	Is a Minor.	Insufficient Pecuniary Means.	Signed other Deeds for Money.	Number of Shares.	Subscribed in Money.
							£.
20123 to 20161 George Lewin -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	50	3,750
20179 to 20214 Robert Lowe -	—	- -	- -	- -	- -	50	3,750
20594 to 20630 George Vernon -	—	- -	- -	—	- -	40	3,000
20637 to 20660 Henry Starling -	—	- -	- -	—	- -	40	3,000
20229 to 20250 Charles Billett -	—	- -	- -	—	- -	20	1,500
19799 to 19896 Thomas Turner -	—	- -	- -	—	- -	170	12,750
19331 to 19433 John Jackson -	—	- -	- -	—	—	20	1,500
18576 to 18600 George Walker -	—	- -	- -	—	- -	35	2,625
17051 to 17222 Samuel Carr - -	—	—	- -	—	- -	1,434	107,550
17224 - Benj. W. Poulton -	—	—	- -	—	—	510	38,250
17936 to 17963 Henry Cooke -	—	—	- -	—	—	125	9,375

(*continued*)

	Signed for another.	Signed for another, and for Money.	Is a Minor.	Insufficient Pecuniary Means.	Signed other Deeds for Money.	Number of Shares.	Subscribed in Money.
17974 to 17992 Henry Cooke	—	—	—	—	—	100	7,500
18264 to 18310 Wm. Joshua Cooke	—	—	—	—	—	182	13,650
18490 to 18511 H. T. Warner	—	—	—	—	—	50	3,750
16882 to 16894 W. J. Mackie	—	—	—	—	—	55	4,125
18538 to 18574 James Stride	—	—	—	—	—	45	3,375
19154 to 19242 Edward Northcote	—	—	—	—	—	20	1,500
19281 to 12286 Archibald Freeman	—	—	—	—	—	10	750
18832 to 18856 A. J. Soares	—	—	—	—	—	200	15,000
18625 to 18636 John Haley	—	—	—	—	—	15	1,125
20268 Charles Moring	—	—	—	—	—	25	1,875
20272 Richard Blakemore	—	—	—	—	—	10	750
20277 John Fielden	—	—	—	—	—	40	3,000
						3,246	243,450

Your Committee will now advert to such of these cases as appear deserving of particular notice.

G. Lewin, 50 shares, 3,750 *l.* R. Lowe, 50 shares, 3,750 *l.*

George Lewin and Robert Lowe are clerks of Messrs. Rennie, and signed the Deed at the request and on behalf of Mr. George Rennie, the brother and partner of Sir John Rennie, one of the engineers of the company. Mr. Lowe states, that Mr. George Rennie, on account of his signing the Deed of 1836, for 100 shares, was precluded from appearing as a witness on the engineering department before the Committee on the Bill of the last session. Mr. Rennie gave this as a reason to Mr. Lowe for his being desirous not to sign the Deed of 1837 himself, and for his requesting Messrs. Lewin and Lowe to sign the Deed, and to hold the shares in trust for him. Mr. Dean, the secretary, was cognizant of this transaction, and allowed the parties to sign the Deed.

G. V. 40 shares, 3,000 *l.*

George Vernon is a clerk in the house of Messrs. Lewis and Davis, of Basinghall-street, cloth-merchants. He signed the Deed for 25 shares, at the request and on the behalf of John Ebenezer Davis, one of his employers; and for 15 shares at the request and on the behalf of Lambert Dexter, in the way of business. He is not able to meet the liability he has incurred from his own resources.

H. S. 40 shares, 3,000 *l.*

Henry Starling is a clerk in the employ of Messrs. Orchard, solicitors, of Hatton-garden. He signed at the request and on the behalf of Mr. Thomas Orchard, one of his employers, who supplied him with the money to pay the deposits. He would not be able to pay that money himself.

Charles Billett is clerk to John Mathey, stockbroker, and has signed at the request and on the behalf of his employer.

T. T. 170 shares, 12,750 *l.*

Thomas Turner is clerk to Joseph Stearns, a stockbroker, at whose instance Turner signed for five shares belonging to his employer; and also for 165 shares belonging to Mr. Mackenzie, a member of the Stock Exchange.

G. W. 35 shares, 2,625 *l.*

George Walker is light porter, at yearly wages of 24 *l.*, with an allowance of 10 *l.* for his dinners, to Joseph Thomson, of No. 7, Old Change, draper, on whose

whose account and by whose directions he took the old certificates and the deposit-money to the Company's office, and signed the Deed. At that time he had not any property of his own.

John Jackson took the benefit of the Insolvent Act some years ago. He signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford Railway Deed for the consideration of 10 *s.* He signed the present Deed at the instance and on the behalf of Henry Parker, stock-jobber, of the Stock Exchange, who might know, he believes, that he was in bad circumstances. He received, in this instance, neither money nor the promise of any money, as a consideration for signing the Deed. J. J. 20 shares, 1,500 *l.*

Samuel Carr, who appears as a subscriber on the Deed for the large amount of 107,550 *l.*, signed on the 14th of November for five shares, and on the 15th of November for 110 shares, together 115 shares; in monied amount 8,625 *l.*, which he states that he bought in the market. He was unable to raise the sum of 10 *l.* 10 *s.* to pay his subscription to the Stock Exchange in 1836, and on this account was obliged to leave it. He admits himself to be in middling circumstances, and one who has been obliged to be on and off the Stock Exchange. Robert Huckvale, who, as will appear in the sequel, was one of Carr's employers, describes him as a man who was, and whom he considered to be, not a man of property. Edward Frith, another of his employers, states that he knows Carr to be a man in indigent circumstances. The said Robert Huckvale and Edward Frith, and a third party, James Whittan, are three members of the Stock Exchange, who job in stock and shares each on his own account, but who, at the end of the year 1836, and at the beginning of the year 1837, had engaged in a sort of partnership for jobbing in Rennie's shares, which they did largely, and were the only parties who did so. Each was aware of the nature of the business which they employed Carr to transact. There is a regulation on the Stock Exchange that shares shall not be sold there, unless signed for on the deed. If shares which have been signed for are wanted, one-eighth advance of price will be given in the share market for those which have been signed for. Huckvale says that he would rather have burnt the shares than have signed this Deed himself. He employed persons of no property to sign, in order to avoid the liability he would incur by signing it himself. He never applied to a person in good circumstances to sign a Deed for him. Frith knew that Huckvale and Whittan were in the habit of employing persons to transact that kind of business; and that men of straw, such as Carr, notoriously not worth a shilling, were put forward for that purpose. Whether those who signed the Deeds were able to fulfil their engagements, was no concern of his; if so, he could neither buy nor sell a share without being first assured that the persons were men of property.

S. C. 1434 shares, 107,550 *l.*
17020 to 17037.
17132.
17484.
18454.
18408. 19960.
17361 to 17371.
18449 to 18451.
18406. 18454.
18469.
17121.
18276.
17544.
17821.
17489.
18457.
18459, 18460.
18472.

Such being the views of the employers, and such the character of the persons to be employed, Huckvale applied to Carr on the 17th of January, stating that he wanted some shares signed for, and could Carr procure him any person to do it. Carr replied that he would undertake to do it for a commission; and an hour or two afterwards Huckvale gave him old certificates for 819 shares, and the deposit-money, with which he went, accompanied by Huckvale, to the office of the Company, signed the deed in his own name, in Huckvale's presence, received the new certificates from Mr. Dean, and handed them to Huckvale, part in the office, in the presence of the officiating persons, and part on going out. On the following day Carr effected

16404. 17128.
17479.
17140.
17141. 17144.
17380.
17154.
17443.
16424. 17170.
17171.
16406. 16415.
17182.

effected for Huckvale, who again accompanied him to the office, a similar exchange of 500 old shares for 500 new, which, on his receiving them, he handed in the office to Huckvale.

17208 to 17210.

17224.

The same day Huckvale applied to Carr to sign for a remnant of shares, which Carr, observing that he had signed himself for as many as was expedient, agreed to get done by a man named Poulton. For all these transactions, including that with Poulton, Huckvale, on the 18th of January, paid Carr a commission of 5*l.*

17265. 17267. 17548. 17553, 17554. 17218 to 17222. 17619 to 17647.

B.W.P. 510 shares, 38,250*l.*

Benjamin Wheeler Poulton has signed the Deed for 510 shares, amounting in money to 38,250*l.* He is one of the parties who signed the Kent and Dover Railway Deed for the reward of 4*s.* According to Carr's account, Poulton had applied to Carr some time before, saying "I am very poor; if you can put a pound in my way, in the signing of shares, do so."

17232, 17233.

17236.

17245.

17250.

17285.

17273. 17276. 17684. 17282. 17292. 17590. 17592. 17595. 17608. 20584.

16478, 16479. 21005. 21013. 21019.

17229. 17667.

17328.

16479. 17654.

21016, 21017.

16492.

16493.

Upon this occasion Carr applied to Poulton, and engaged him, for a sovereign, to sign for and exchange Huckvale's shares that very day. Poulton went with Carr and Huckvale to the Company's office, where, in the presence of them and of several other persons, he signed the deed. Huckvale gave the certificates to Carr, who presented them to Mr. Dean. An indulgence was asked for by Huckvale, which Mr. Dean granted, that a certain portion of the deposit-money should be left unpaid until another day; and that old certificates to a corresponding amount should be left at the office, as a security for the payment. A deposit of 110*l.* was paid at the time, and new certificates to a corresponding amount were handed to the parties. An acknowledgment of having received of W. B. Poulton 400 old certificates, was given by Mr. Dean to Carr, which Carr afterwards handed to Huckvale. The same afternoon Carr paid to Poulton a sovereign, which was part of the 5*l.* he had previously received from Huckvale. Huckvale went alone on the 28th of January to the Company's Office, presented to Mr. Dean the receipt for 400 old shares, paid to him the sum of 400*l.*, and on signing an acknowledgment that he had received the same for W. B. Poulton, received from Mr. Dean 400 new shares.

H.C. 225 shares, 16,875*l.*

17952, 17953.

17951. 17939. 17941.

18378. 18383.

Henry Cooke, who has signed the Deed for 225 shares, in monied amount 16,875*l.*, has been employed by the above-mentioned James Whittan to sign the Deed for 125 shares, 9,375*l.*; and by the above-named Robert Huckvale to sign the Deed for 100 shares, 7,500*l.* Cooke is now confined in Whitecross-street prison for a debt of 34*l.*, and when he signed the deed, he was not "in very flourishing circumstances, any more than he is now."

In January, just previous to the issue of the new shares of this Company, Whittan applied to Henry Cooke to obtain for him new shares for old. He was aware at the time that this was to be effected by signing the Deed; he understood that responsibility attached to signing, and he was unwilling to incur this responsibility himself. Whittan handed to Cooke 125 old shares, and 125*l.* to pay the deposits; and Cooke brought back to Whittan 125 new certificates. He would not have trusted Cooke for a single night with 125*l.*; but he trusted him in this instance to get rid of a responsibility. Whittan did not know whether Cooke, or some other person in Cooke's employ, would sign the Deed. As long as he got his shares, he was careless who signed. Whittan paid Cooke, Whittan says 20*s.*, Cooke says 30*s.* for his trouble.

18379. 18397.

18390.

17942, 17943. 17945. 17949, 17950. 17964. 18390. 18399 to 18402.

17962.

17963. 18393.

About the end of last year, Huckvale applied to Cooke to obtain for him new shares for old. He delivered to Cooke old shares, and money to pay

17616. 17720.

17980. 17996.

the

the deposits. Huckvale knew he could not obtain the shares, unless the Deed was signed. He did not know whether Cooke himself, or some one of his procuring, would sign the Deed. He thinks it very likely that Cooke signed. He did not believe Cooke to be a rich man. Cooke brought the new certificates to Huckvale the same afternoon; who thereupon paid him a sovereign for his trouble. 17735. 17981. 17737. 17714. 17727. 17992.

When Cooke was acting for other parties, he has usually had a consideration for the job; though on some occasions, to oblige a friend, he may have signed for nothing. He has signed the Deeds of the following Railway Companies; viz. Deptford and Dover, Gibbs' Brighton, the Great Northern, the Eastern Counties; indeed so many that he cannot recollect which they are. When Cooke has signed any deed for what he deems a sufficient amount, or a sufficient number of times, he has engaged his father, William Joshua Cooke, to sign, but not for a pecuniary consideration: he occasionally gives or lends his father money. 18023. 18025. 18014. 18042. 18018. 17994, 17995. 18020. 18273.

William Joshua Cooke has signed for 182 shares, 13,650*l.*, in this Company, at the instance of his son, Henry Cooke, who provided him with the money to pay the deposits. Henry Cooke admits that his father is poor, and is not good for 100*l.* William Joshua Cooke signed the deeds of City and South Midland Railway Companies for his son. 18264. 18266. 18294.

The only cases of persons under age, subscribers to the Deed, that Your Committee considers it necessary to notice, are the following:

Archibald Freeman, aged 20, clerk to Messrs. Dawson, of Billiter-square, ship-owners, at a salary of 80*l.* a year, signed the deed at the request and on the behalf of Mr. James Dawson, a ship's biscuit baker, and son to one of Freeman's employers. A. F. 10 shares, 750*l.* 19281 to 19286.

William James Mackie, in his eighteenth year, clerk to Messrs. J. & T. Moxon, of Old Broad-street, stockbrokers, signed the deed twice, the first time for 30 shares, 2,250*l.*; the second time for 25 shares, 1,875*l.* The shares were sent up to his employers by correspondents in the country, and handed to him by his employers to pay the calls upon. Mackie states that he informed the secretary on both occasions that he came to pay the calls, not on his own account, but on account of country correspondents of Messrs. Moxon. The first time he signed the deed in his own name in the presence of the secretary; the second time, which was on the 25th of January, he was informed by the secretary that the shares were forfeited. Upon this one of his employers had a communication with Mr. Robert Sutton, junior, one of the Directors; in consequence of which the Directors instructed Mr. Dean to allow the transaction to proceed; and Mackie attended again, and received the new certificates, on paying the deposits and signing the Deed. 16882 to 16901. 20438 to 20448.

Henry Frederick Warner, aged 16, is clerk to Mr. Williams, of 39, Lothbury, stockbroker. When Warner went to sign the Deed at the Company's office, which he did on the 18th of January, Mr. Williams, who accompanied Warner, informed the clerks in the office, that the shares were his shares, and that Warner was to sign for them on Williams's account. Mr. Dean was not present in the office when this conversation occurred. H. F. W. 50 shares, 3,750*l.* 18490 to 18524.

James Stride, who was in his 19th year last January, when he signed the Deed, is clerk to Messrs. Wilson, No. 124, Wood-street, merchants. He is described in the Deed as of Wood-street, *merchant*. He signed at the request and on behalf of Mr. Lea Wilson, one of his employers, who paid him the deposit money, delivered to him the old certificates to be exchanged, J. S. 45 shares, 3,375*l.*

and suggested to him that he should describe himself in the Deed as *merchant.*

The moiety of the estimated expense of the Undertaking, is 600,000 *l.*: the amount actually subscribed upon the Deed at the time of the copy of it being lodged in the Private Bill Office, was 991,425 *l.*, from which, deducting the sum of 243,450 *l.*, which appears to Your Committee to be the amount of the sums subscribed, that are not of a *bonâ fide* kind, there will remain the sum of 747,975 *l.*, which exceeds, by the sum of 147,975 *l.*, the amount required by the Standing Orders to have been subscribed.

It might, however, with much force be also contended, that as the Subscribers' Agreement of 1836 gives no authority, either to the Directors or to the Provisional Committee, or to a general meeting of Subscribers, to cause the forfeiture of any shares, by reason of the non payment of any additional call agreed to at a general meeting, the 2,150 shares which the Directors of their own authority have declared to be forfeited, and which they have divided amongst themselves, and which they signed for on the Deed previous to its being deposited, as though they were shares brought in and exchanged by the actual holders, that these shares ought not to be included among the *bonâ fide* subscriptions, but ought to be regarded as original shares not yet brought in. On this view of the subject, the amount of subscription would have to be further reduced by 2,150 shares, or by the sum of 161,230 *l.*, which would bring the amount of *bonâ fide* subscriptions to 586,725 *l.*, or 13,275 *l.* below the moiety of the estimated expense.

The Bill not having advanced through Parliament by the beaten track; but, during the sitting of your Committee, the Subscription List of this Company and of several other Companies, for forming competing lines of Railway, having been consolidated into one common Subscription List; the decision of Your Committee on the point last mooted in this Report, has been rendered unnecessary. Whatever may be, in the List here investigated, the ratio which the colourable bear to the real subscriptions, that ratio will, in the consolidated List, undergo a still further reduction, in proportion to the number of subscription lists that have been thus consolidated.

The result of this Inquiry, as it affects this particular List, has become of little moment. It appears, however, to your Committee, that the abuses in the working of the present Standing Orders which have been brought to light in the course of the inquiry into this particular case, are scarcely less striking than those which were disclosed on the inquiry into the state of the Subscription List of the Kent Railway Company, which was the first of the cases that your Committee investigated. A long-continued traffic in the depreciated shares of a Company, defeated in its endeavours to obtain an Act of Parliament, and the formation of the transferrees of those depreciated shares into a new Company, are the common incidents in the two cases, that have been followed by nearly similar results: results which it is to be hoped may be prevented from occurring in future, in other cases, by a timely amendment of the present Standing Orders.

14 *July* 1837.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Mercurii, 24° *die Maii*, 1837.

Present.

MR. WARBURTON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.

Mr. Roe was heard to sum up the Evidence.

[Adjourned.

Jovis, 25° *die Maii*, 1837.

Present.

MR. WARBURTON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.

Mr. Clarkson was heard on behalf of the Directors of the Rennie's Line.

[Adjourned.

Martis, 30° *die Maii*, 1837.

Present.

MR. WARBURTON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Thornely.

The Committee deliberated on the Report.

[Adjourned.

Jovis, 1° *die Junii*, 1837.

Present.

MR. WARBURTON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.

[Adjourned.

Lunæ, 10° *die Julii*, 1837.

Present.

MR. WARBURTON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.

Report read;—considered and agreed to.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Mercurii, 10° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Henry Dean - - - - - - - - - p. 1

Jovis, 10° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Henry Dean - - - - - - - - - p. 19
Mr. William James Mackie - - - - - - - - p. 30
Mr. James Van Sumner - - - - - - - - p. 34
Samuel Carr - - - - - - - - - p. 35
Mr. Robert Huckvale - - - - - - - - p. 43

Veneris, 12° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Robert Huckvale - - - - - - - - p. 56
Henry Cooke - - - - - - - - - p. 62
William Joshua Cooke - - - - - - - - p. 73
Mr. James Whittan - - - - - - - - p. 76
Mr. Edward Frith - - - - - - - - p. 79
Henry Frederick Warner - - - - - - - p. 81
James Stride - - - - - - - - - p. 82
George Walker - - - - - - - - - p. 83
John Haley - - - - - - - - - p. 84
William Bourne - - - - - - - - - p. 86

Veneris, 19° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Antonio Joachim Soares - - - - - - - p. 88
Mr. Robert Huckvale - - - - - - - - p. 93
Mr. Edward Frith - - - - - - - - p. 96

Sabbati, 20° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Edward Northcote - - - - - - - - p. 101
Archibald Freeman - - - - - - - - p. 104
John Jackson - - - - - - - - - p. 105
Alfred Ryder - - - - - - - - - p. 114
Mr. Joseph Stearns - - - - - - - - p. 117
Mr. James Whittan - - - - - - - - p. 121
Mr. George Lewin - - - - - - - - p. 128
Mr. Robert Lowe - - - - - - - - p. 129

Lunæ, 22° die Maii, 1837.

Charles Billett - - - - - - - - - p. 131
William Cook - - - - - - - - - p. 133
Thomas Ford - - - - - - - - - p. 133
Mr. Henry Dean - - - - - - - - - p. 133
Mr. George Vernon - - - - - - - - p. 148
Henry Starling - - - - - - - - - p. 150

Martis, 23° die Maii, 1837.

Mr. Henry Dean - - - - - - - - - p. 151

Mercurii, 24° die Maii, 1837 - - - p. 177

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Mercurii, 10° *die Maii*, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. Thornely.
Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

DIRECT LONDON AND BRIGHTON RAILWAY (RENNIE'S LINE).

THE Petition of *Richard Till*, Secretary of the Brighton Railway Company (Stephenson's line) was read.

Mr. *Austin* and Mr. *Rowe* appeared in support of the Petition.

The Petition of *Henry Cooke* was read.

The Petition of *Benjamin Wheeler Poulton* was read.

The Petition of *Daniel Edward Stephens* was read.

Mr. *Austin* and Mr. *Rowe* appeared in support of the last Petition.

The Petition of *Samuel Carr* was read.

The Petition of *Robert Huckvale* and others was read.

The Petition of *William Cooke* was read.

The Petition of *Joseph Thompson* was read.

The Petition of *George Walker* was read.

The Petition of *Richard Blackmore* was read.

The Petition of *John Haley* was read.

The Petition of the members of the Provisional Committee, Solicitors, and Secretary of the Brighton Railway (Rennie's line) was read.

Mr. *Clarkson* and Mr. *Alexander* appeared in support of the last Petition.

Mr. *Henry Dean*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. Henry Dean. 10 May 1837.

16063. Mr. *Austin*.] ARE you secretary to the Brighton company called the Direct Company?—I am.

16064. Is that the name of it?—The Direct London and Brighton Railway.

16065. How long have you been so?—Ever since the company was formed.

16066. When was the company formed?—The 2d of February 1836.

16067. No, that is the new company?—I am speaking of the first company; the 2d of February 1836.

16068. That is the first company, is it?—Yes.

16069. It began February 1836?—Yes.

16070. What was the capital of that company?—£.800,000.

16071. What was the amount of the shares?—50*l.* each.

16072. What was the deposit upon each share?—£.2.

16073. Have you the form of the certificate of those shares to be delivered to the subscribers?—Yes, I have.

16074. Produce one?—It will be here immediately.

16075. There was a certificate?—Yes.

16076. For 2 *l.*?—Yes.

16077. I presume, upon a person paying down 2*l.*, the certificate was handed to him?—That did not follow as a matter of course, because the money, the deposit, was paid to the bankers to a certain extent; there was a limit, and they

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

they took the bankers' receipt, and that receipt they brought to me at any time they chose afterwards, and got the scrip in lieu of it.

16078. The original mode was payment to the bankers?—Yes.

16079. Who were the bankers?—Messrs. Hankey.

16080. The sole bankers?—In London.

16081. A certificate was granted upon payment of the deposit before made, and in exchange for the bankers' receipt?—Yes.

16082. And the bankers' receipt might have passed through many intervening hands?—Yes, possibly.

16083. And the holder of that receipt was entitled to a certificate?—Yes, certainly.

16084. Upon the certificate being delivered, was the deed signed?—No, that was signed at the bankers'.

16085. At the bankers'?—Yes.

16086. *Chairman.*] The deed was signed at the time of the payment of the deposit?—Yes.

16087. Mr. *Austin.*] That is so?—Yes.

16088. Was the deed always signed at Messrs. Hankey's?—I think it was; I do not remember an instance to the contrary.

[*A copy of the certificate was produced.*]

16089. This is the form of the certificate?—Yes.

16090. Just give me half a dozen of them?—I have not any other; I had a notice to produce a copy of the scrip certificate, and that is one that has not been used.

16091. With respect to the deed, the deed was at Messrs. Hankey's, the bankers; did it remain there the whole time?—It remained there during the period limited by public advertisement.

16092. What period was that?—I think it was from the 12th to the 14th of February; I am not sure; it was a very few days.

16093. Am I to understand that it remained there for two days?—Two or three days.

16094. Only?—About that period.

16095. To what place was it transferred then?—It was taken to the solicitors' office.

16096. Where is that?—Basinghall-street.

16097. How long did it remain there?—Ever since.

16098. It has never been removed?—Not to my knowledge.

16099. *Chairman.*] What is the name of the solicitor?—Messrs. Sweet and Sutton.

16100. Mr. *Austin.*] Do you mean to say that all the signatures attached to the deed were attached at the bankers'?—To the best of my knowledge, every one.

16101. None were attached except at the bankers'?—I believe not; to the best of my knowledge, not one.

16102. Then do you describe the process to be this, that the person paid his 2 *l.* deposit and signed the deed, and that the receipt entitled the bearer to a certificate?—Yes, that was the process.

16103. *Chairman.*] Did the banker refuse to receive the deposit, unless the depositor signed the deed at the time?—The bankers had no discretion in the matter; for the authority they had to receive the amount of deposit from any applicant, was that applicant producing a letter of allotment.

16104. Mr. *Austin.*] That was the first step; the party applying at the bankers' must not only pay the deposit, but produce a letter of allotment?—Yes.

16105. If he produced a letter of allotment, and offered to pay the deposit upon the shares mentioned in the letter of allotment, was he required to sign the deed?—Yes.

16106. *Chairman.*] Did they refuse to take the deposit unless he signed the deed?—They would not have taken the deposit; but that was a case, so far as I know, that did not occur.

16107. They were instructed to require him, at the time of paying the deposit, to sign the deed?—Yes.

16108. Mr. *Austin.*] Where was that letter of allotment obtained?—The letters

letters were all sent, I believe, by the post; there might be a few delivered by hand, living near.

16109. To what parties were they sent?—To the parties to whom the shares were allotted by the company.

16110. By the directors?—Yes.

16111. I am right in that?—Quite right.

16112. The directors made allotments upon applications?—There were a great many applicants that did not get allotments.

16113. The directors made allotments upon applications?—Yes.

16114. You are still speaking of the first deed?—Yes, of course I am confining myself to that.

16115. When was the second deed; when did that begin to be executed?—On the 12th of November.

16116. *Chairman.*] November last?—Yes, 1836.

16117. Mr. *Austin.*] At that time what amount of original deposits remained on hand?—None at all.

16118. They were all exhausted, were they?—Yes.

16119. And more?—Yes.

16120. To what extent?—I think, in round figures, about 8,000 *l.*

16121. At that moment the old company were 8,000 *l.* in debt?—Yes, exactly.

16122. Have you the books of the old company here?—They are all here. I have not considered it as the old and new company. I have the books of both companies here.

16123. It is merely to distinguish the one from the other?—Very well.

16124. Do you produce the books of the old company?—Yes, I do.

16125. What are the books?—This [*producing a book*] is a list, alphabetically arranged, of the applications that were made for shares; that was the groundwork.

16126. Do you call that book No. 1?—Yes.

16127. That is all it contains?—Yes, that is all that contains.

16128. What is the next?—The cash-book.

16129. What is the cash-book; how is it kept?—In the usual way; a debtor and creditor account; it shows the money received and money paid.

16130. Before you come to a cash-book of that description you must have a banker's pass-book?—We have the bankers' book.

16131. That would come next, and before the other?—In any order you please.

16132. The pass-book would be No. 2?—No; No. 3.

16133. The application-book No. 1, pass-book No. 2, and the cash-book is a copy of or check to that pass-book?—Yes, of course it is; it ought to be.

16134. And something more?—It contains a debtor and creditor account, as far as the company are concerned.

16135. By the cash-book you check the pass-book?—Yes.

16136. What will No. 4 be?—I have here the shareholders' book, the names, a sort of register of the shares.

16137. You call that the register-book?—Yes.

16138. That contains the names of the first set of shareholders?—Yes.

16139. Does that book contain the names of the signers of the deed, or does it contain the names of the holders of scrip?—The names of the signers of the deed.

16140. And no others?—No.

16141. Then it is nothing but a copy of the signatures to the deed?—Yes.

16142. Alphabetically arranged?—There is an alphabet to it.

16143. What other books have you?—I have no more in the shape of books brought over.

16144. Does that comprise all the documents in which you keep the accounts of the company?—There is a ledger which is not here; I will send for it.

16145. No, I am not anxious to see it. Is the ledger anything more than an arrangement of the cash-book under heads?—That is all, with the names of the customers or creditors.

16146. The word "ledger" means in this company what it does in ordinary commercial concerns?—Yes.

16147. You have a minute-book of the proceedings?—Yes.

16148. That

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

16148. That will be No. 6?—Yes.

16149. Do you produce the minute-book?—It is not here: do you wish it?

16150. If you please?—There are three minute-books.

[*The minute-books were sent for.*]

16151. Just show me the application-book for a moment.

[*The book was handed to Mr. Austin.*]

16152. Are those all the books that were kept by the directors?—Yes.

16153. Are there no others?—No.

16154. Will it appear from your cash-book that the company were 8,000 *l.* in debt when the new deed was signed?—I do not think it will.

16155. In what book will it appear?—It will appear in the balance sheet drawn out.

16156. Where will that appear?—In the ledger.

16157. Will it appear in the ledger?—Yes, certainly.

16158. Then I am to understand you to say, before the second deed was signed, you had issued certificates of this description, the white certificates?—Yes.

16159. The next were in a different colour?—Yes, blue.

16160. You had issued those certificates to an amount to produce how much?—£. 32,000, less 15 shares, or 31,970 *l.*

16161. Then, in fact, the expenditure of the company had been 40,000 *l.* when the new deed was signed?—Yes.

16162. The new company was formed in the autumn of last year?—Yes.

It was agreed no inference was to be drawn from the use of the terms "new" and "old" company.

16163. Mr. *Austin.*] The new company, you say, was formed in the autumn of last year?—Yes, it was.

16164. When did they first give instructions to their bankers to receive deposits, and begin to issue certificates and so forth? when did they advertise? you began with an advertisement?—The limit was from the 12th to the 15th of November.

16165. When was the first advertisement published?—About the last week in October. I think I can tell you exactly; it was October the 21st.

16166. Have you got that advertisement?—This is a copy of it.

16167. Just read it?—"The Direct London and Brighton Railway. A call of 2 *l.* per share having been unanimously resolved upon at the general meeting of the subscribers to this undertaking, held at the London Tavern on the 18th of October instant, to be paid at such time as the directors should appoint, the directors hereby give notice and require the subscribers to pay, between the 12th and 15th of November next inclusive, 1 *l.* per share, being a moiety of such 2 *l.* call, to Messrs. Hankey, bankers, Fenchurch-street, London, or to Messrs. Hall, West & Co., bankers, Brighton, who are authorized to receive and give receipts for the same, upon the subscribers signing the usual Parliamentary contract and subscribers' agreement, which will be left with the bankers for that purpose. All shares upon which the before-mentioned payment shall not be made within the above time limited will become forfeited. By order of the directors. H. Dean, secretary, 3, Chapel-place, Poultry, Oct. 21."

16168. That is an order, I see, requiring persons to pay to the bankers 1 *l.* per share?—Yes.

16169. And stating there had been a 2 *l.* call before?—No, it did not state that.

16170. It is a call of a moiety of a call for 2 *l.*?—Yes.

16171. The directors had authorized a call of 2 *l.*?—The shareholders authorized the directors at a former meeting to call for 2 *l.* a share, in order to renew the application to Parliament this session, and they were authorized to make a call for a moiety of the 2 *l.*, calling for the other moiety whenever they might think it proper.

16172. Was that a call upon the old scrip?—It was a call upon all the shareholders and subscribers.

16173. Upon all the existing shareholders and subscribers?—Yes.

16174. That

16174. That is to say, upon the old scrip?—Yes, of course.

16175. That is the first act of the new company?—Yes.

16176. You say that the whole capital was 800,000 *l.*?—Yes.

16177. Did you not increase your capital?—It was subsequently increased to 900,000 *l.*; that was put in the Bill.

16178. That was the amount for the second company?—No, that was 1,200,000 *l.*

16179. Did they not publish a prospectus or advertisement, by which the capital was enlarged to 1,200,000 *l.*?—They published the proceedings of a general meeting, at which it was decided that the capital should be increased to 1,200,000 *l.*

16180. Was that the second advertisement?—It came out the day after the meeting; it appeared several times.

16181. Was it after the other advertisement you have just read?—No, it was prior to that.

16182. Have you a copy of it?—Yes, this is it [*producing a paper*].

16183. Just read it.—"The Direct London and Brighton Railway.—At a numerous meeting of the subscribers to this undertaking, held at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate-street, on the 18th day of October instant, pursuant to public advertisement, Sir William G. H. Jolliffe, Bart., in the chair. The report of the directors, with the reports of the engineers, were read. Resolved unanimously, that the report of the directors now read to the meeting be received and adopted. Resolved unanimously, that the directors do renew the application to Parliament in the ensuing session, for obtaining an Act for a direct line of railway to Brighton, with branches to Shoreham, Lewes and Newhaven, and Reigate, and take all such means in relation thereto as they shall think proper. Resolved unanimously, that the capital of the company be increased to 1,200,000 *l.*, by converting every 50 *l.* share into a 75 *l.*, and that a call of 2 *l.* be and the same is hereby made upon each share, to be paid at such time or times as the directors may appoint. (Signed) W. G. H. Jolliffe, chairman."

16184. That is the first advertisement?—Yes.

16185. The other advertisement you have read will be No. 2?—Yes.

16186. Was the capital accordingly increased to 1,200,000 *l.*?—Yes.

16187. What means did you take to extend the number of shareholders?—We did not increase that; it was done by increasing the value of the shares, instead of increasing the number of shareholders.

16188. Was that done?—Yes.

16189. That was the way the additional sum was made up?—Yes.

16190. Will you be so good as to give me the next certificate?—This is it—[*handing to Mr. Austin the form of certificate*].

16191. I see this is 75 *l.*, and 3 *l.* per share; how is that?—

Chairman.] That is the two and the one?—Yes.

16192. Mr. *Austin.*] According to my understanding, this blue paper represents the white paper, and half the additional call?—Yes, it represents the white paper and an additional 1 *l.*

16193. It represents the whole of the 2 *l.* and the call of 1 *l.*?—Yes.

16194. There was a resolution that 2 *l.* should be deposited, and that 1 *l.* should be called for; is that so?—Yes.

16195. Did you not tell me that at the meeting in August there was a resolution for 2 *l.*?—No, it was at a general meeting of the shareholders; they authorized the directors to make a call of 2 *l.*, and the directors, in the exercise of their discretion, chose not to call for 2 *l.*, but 1 *l.*; that blue paper represents the whole of that moiety, and 2 *l.* under the white certificate.

16196. Did you not tell me there were 18,000 shareholders?—No, 16,000 shares.

16197. In the first company?—Yes.

16198. By multiplying that number by 75, I find you fall greatly short of 1,200,000 *l.*—My figures make it so.

16199. Just try it?—That is the sum.

16200. You say 16,000 shares in the original company?—Yes.

16201. In the Report of the House of Commons last year there are 18,000?—I do not know what the Report may say; there was no such thing.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

16202. You were the witness upon whom the report was made?—I stated 16,000 certainly; the capital was 800,000 *l.*; 50 *l.* shares could not have given 18,000 shares.

16203. It was 18,000 allotted?—No, 16,000, as the certificate states.

16204. The material thing is this, which I have got from you more than once, that the 1,200,000 *l.* represents the same subscribers as the 800,000 *l.* or 900,000 *l.*?—It represented the same number of shares; the 1,200,000 *l.* was represented by the same number of shares, being increased from 50 *l.* to 75 *l.*

16205. Not the same number of shareholders?—No.

16206. How many subscribers were there to the old company?—About 412 I think there were, or 400.

16207. I am told there is not so many as that?—I do not bind myself to it. [*The Witness counted the names in the book.*]—There are 396 names.

16208. Are there any names repeated there?—Yes, there are.

16209. You say there are names repeated?—Yes.

[*The original Deeds were handed to the Chairman.*]

16210. This alphabetical book you have been counting contains names twice over?—Yes.

16211. Is that a copy of the original deed?—I cannot tell.

16212. You did not make it out?—No.

16213. Was it not used by the directors as representing the signatures to the original deed?—No; I do not know that the directors ever saw it.

16214. What was it made for?—As a register of the shares.

16215. And the shares were held by the persons who signed the deed?—They were originally got by them.

16216. Do you mean to say there are any names in that book that are not in the deed?—I believe not.

16217. *Chairman.*] Do you believe it to be correct?—Yes; and the doubt I had in answering the question is this, that a person might have taken his shares, if it were 200 shares, at two different times, and in my book it would appear so, but he might have signed for them at once in the deed.

16218. Mr. *Austin.*] You do not know how many names there are repeated?—No; I do not, without looking.

16219. Do you know whether 340 is the true number?—No; I should think there are more.

16220. You will deliver in to the Committee the actual number?—Yes, I will, certainly.

16221. Were the subscribers to the old deed the same parties that were contained in the letters of allotment?—Yes.

16222. Are you sure of that?—Speaking from recollection, I should say certainly.

16223. Do you recollect any instance in which the names were altered?—No; I do not.

16224. Do you know of any instance in which the letters of allotment passed from the hands of the persons described in them before the deed was subscribed?—No; I do not.

16225. You are speaking now of the first deed?—Yes.

16226. You have told us there are from 340 to 390 subscribers to the first deed. How many subscribers were there to the second?—There are about 230 in London, and there are about 20 who signed at Brighton, and there are some six or eight who signed at Liverpool, or Birmingham or Manchester.

16227. Can you give me the whole number?—About 260.

16228. Not more than 260?—No.

16229. Do I understand you, that the total number of subscribers had been diminished?—Yes.

16230. By the difference between the last number and the first?—Yes.

16231. Now, can you tell me how many subscribers to the first deed, were subscribers to the second?—No, I cannot.

16232. Have you ever made that inquiry?—No.

16233. Have you ever examined the names?—I have never made the comparison.

16234. Do you happen to know that, of all the subscribers to the new deed, there

there were not more than 40 who signed the old deed?—No; I have not the slightest idea of it.

16235. You do not know whether the number is about 40?—I do not know.

16236. Do you happen to know to what extent those subscribers of the original deed, who remain upon the new deed, have increased their subscriptions?—No; I have never given my attention to it.

16237. Or to what extent any of them may have diminished their subscription?—No.

16238. Have you ever observed this fact, whether or not 28 of the original subscribers, whose names appear on the new deed, have increased their subscriptions from 78,000 *l.* to 380,000 *l.*?—No; I have not.

16239. Do you undertake to say that it is not so?—No, I do not; I should doubt it very much.

16240. Just look at John Harman, upon the old deed; what was his subscription upon the old deed?—He appears here for 520 shares.

16241. How much would that make in money?—£. 50 shares, that is 25,000 *l.*, and rather more.

16242. *Chairman.*] It is 26,000 *l.*?—Yes.

16243. Mr. *Austin.*] Just allow me to look at that book.

[*The book was handed to Mr. Austin, and explained by the Witness.*]

Mr. *Austin* proposed to call for the following returns:—

A return stating how many persons were subscribers upon the old deed; how many were subscribers upon the new deed; how many of the subscribers upon the old deed are subscribers upon the new deed; and of those persons, how many have decreased their subscriptions, and in what amounts; and how many have increased their subscriptions, and in what amounts.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to Mr. Austin's right, as appearing for Mr. Till, to call for the returns now specified, on the ground that this was a charge of fraud, and the parties charging the fraud had no right to call upon the parties charged to furnish evidence of that fraud.

The *Chairman* stated that the Committee did not consider it as a charge of fraud; but that, as these were parties claiming extensive powers, it was the duty of the Committee to ascertain whether they came into Parliament with clean hands; and the returns must therefore be furnished.

16244. Mr. *Austin.*] Have you examined the Parliamentary contract and deed?—Yes.

16245. Are the names the same?—Quite.

Mr. *Austin* proposed to call for a comparison of the names in the allotment-book, and the names in the deeds.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to being called upon to furnish copies of expensive books.

The *Chairman* stated that all that would be necessary would be to take the names from the letters of allotment.

The second case was different from the first: in the second case there was no allotment of shares at all; the parties who were the holders of the old scrip, whoever they might be, were at liberty to come in with the old scrip, and, upon paying the deposit and signing the Parliamentary deeds, to get the new scrip and demand it.

16246. *Chairman.*] Do you know in the new deed who the parties were?—No.

16247. Mr. *Austin.*] You say that the parties holding the original scrip or white certificate were entitled to come in and, upon payment of 1 *l.* a share, to get a blue certificate in exchange?—Yes; and upon signing the Parliamentary deed.

16248. You say there was no allotment upon the second deed at all?—No.

16249. You took that white certificate in the fashion you have described, without inquiring whether it had changed hands?—Yes.

16250. What was the direction given to the banker?—The banker was instructed to receive the money, upon the parties signing the deeds; they were left

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

left there for the period limited, and the parties so signing, upon producing to me the bankers' receipt for the increased deposit, and the old scrip for the number of shares, got the new scrip.

16251. That is not an answer to my question; what instructions were given to the banker?—To receive the deposit.

16252. And the old certificate?—No; he had nothing to do but receive the deposit, upon the parties signing the Parliamentary contract; that was his duty.

16253. The instructions were, that the bankers, upon receiving 1 *l.*, or the party tendering the 1 *l.* and signing the Parliamentary contract, to give a receipt?—Yes.

16254. Without producing any letter of allotment?—Yes; there was no letter of allotment.

16255. Or the old scrip?—Yes.

16256. Then any party going to the banker under his second instructions, tendering him 1 *l.* for every share that he demanded, and signing the deed lying at the bankers', was entitled to a receipt?—Yes.

16257. And whatever his name might be, without inquiring as to his name, the banker had no authority to refuse?—No.

16258. So that if any person totally unconnected with the old company had gone with 10 sovereigns in his hand, and demanding a receipt for 10 shares, upon signing the deed, would have got a receipt?—Yes.

16259. Any person who had got his shares in that fashion, coming with a couple of certificates of this sort to you and the bankers' receipt, would have been entitled to two of those blue papers?—Yes.

16260. Whatever the name of that party might be?—Yes; I have no means of ascertaining it.

16261. Without any reference to the old letter of allotment?—Yes; without any reference to it.

16262. And without any reference to the name of the party in the margin of the old certificate?—Yes.

16263. If it had appeared that the name of John Doe had been inserted in the margin of the certificate, and if Richard Roe had presented himself with the banker's receipt and John Doe's certificate, you would have given him a blue certificate?—Yes.

16264. The name would appear upon the duplicate of the certificate?—Yes.

16265. In what, as it is called the talon?—Yes.

16266. *Chairman.*] When he came back to the office with the bankers' receipt and the old scrip in his hand, and when they cut off the blue certificate and delivered it to him in exchange for the bankers' receipt and the old scrip together, did they enter upon the talon the name of the party to whom the certificates were issued?—Yes.

16267. Mr. *Austin.*] That is to say, the party who presented himself?—Yes; the same name was put on the talon as appeared in the bankers' receipt, as the man who had paid the money.

16268. You filled in the talon from the banker's receipt?—Yes.

16269. And the banker's receipt was made out of course in the name given to them?—In the name of the party signing the deed.

16270. How long was the banker's open for the purpose of these operations, with regard to the new company?—From the 12th to the 15th of November.

16271. Three days, as before?—Yes.

16272. Were any other certificates given after that?—Yes.

16273. Were subscriptions received after that?—Yes.

16274. In the case of the new company, I understand that all these operations were not transacted at the bankers'?—They were not.

16275. How long did you continue handing out new certificates and receiving new subscriptions after the affair had closed at the banker's.—The next limit was the 18th of January.

16276. Was that appointed limit enlarged?—No, not after the 18th.

16277. Do I understand you to say that no certificates were granted or subscriptions received after the 18th of January?—No, I did not say any such thing.

16278. Was there a second limit appointed?—No, that was the final limit, as you use the word limit; what were issued afterwards were special cases. Here is the advertisement:—"To Holders of Old Scrip: Notice is hereby given, that

that no old scrip will be received in exchange for the new after four o'clock on Wednesday the 18th January instant, from which time the old scrip will become, by default of the holders, null and void. Attendance will be given daily at the office of the company, from ten till four. By order of the directors. H. Dean, secretary, 3, Chapel-place, Poultry, 11 January 1837."

16279. Then, I understand the thing to have taken place thus: there were three days given at the bankers' after the bankers had closed for the receipt of subscriptions; then subscriptions continued to be received until the 18th of January?—Yes.

16280. Where?—At the office of the company.

16281. Where situate?—3, Chapel-place, Poultry.

16282. Not at Sweet and Sutton's?—No.

16283. Received up to the 18th of January in the same manner as at the bankers'?—Yes, just the same.

16284. After the 18th of January they were received as special cases?—Yes, at the offices of the company.

16285. Up to what time?—I think we have received subscriptions as late as three weeks ago, but I cannot call to mind.

16286. May I assume truly you have been from time to time continually receiving subscriptions?—Yes, in special cases.

16287. Were you present at the Poultry when parties presented themselves?—Yes, I was.

16288. Upon those occasions, in what way was the business conducted?—For a considerable time, until the limit, it was done in the board-room, where I myself sat always.

16289. You call it the board-room: did the directors sit there?—Yes.

16290. How was the business done in the board-room?—The party came with his old scrip and his money, and said he had come to sign the deed and pay his deposit, and return the old scrip and receive the new; upon which a clerk was immediately rung for by me, and witnessed the signature; and the party, upon paying his money, got new scrip for the old, and away he went.

16291. Did you see those transactions to any considerable extent yourself?—Yes.

16292. Were any inquiries made?—As to what?

16293. With respect to any circumstances, except the production of the scrip.—No.

16294. No inquiries?—No.

16295. Any person presenting himself with a piece of paper and *5l.* had a new paper in return?—Yes, on signing the deed.

16296. How many signatures have been attached to the second deed at the bankers'?—About 2,500.

16297. Two thousand five hundred signatures?—No, for shares.

16298. Two thousand five hundred shares subscribed for?—Yes.

16299. You do not know the number of names attached to the deed at the bankers'?—No, but I can ascertain it, and I will, if you wish it.

16300. If you please. How many persons signed the deed within the limit, at your office?—That I cannot tell you.

16301. Nor for what amount of shares?—No.

16302. Can you ascertain that also?—I do not think it possible accuratley, because there are no dates to the parties' signatures.

16303. How many signed after the limit, and for how many shares?—After the limit at the bankers'?

16304. No; I thought we used the word limit to mean the 18th?—There are two limits.

16305. One at the bankers'?—Yes.

16306. That is the first limit, and the 18th is the second?—Yes.

16307. How many signed after January the 18th?—That I cannot tell.

16308. Nor the amount?—No.

16309. Do you recollect the circumstances of any of those subscriptions after the 18th of January?—Yes, I recollect several.

16310. That took place in the board-room?—We left the city the 28th of January, and I cannot recollect whether it was in the city a day or two before the 28th, or a day or two after the 28th, after we got to Westminster.

16311. You say, when you were in the city, up to the 18th of January, this

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

affair was conducted in the board-room?—No, I said up to the beginning of the limit, which would be up to the 11th or 12th of January; then it was done partly in my office, because the board were sitting daily, and it could not be done in the board-room.

16312. Where was it done after the 18th of January?—The deeds were in my clerk's office, where the parties came to sign, and then the parties came to me, bringing me a scrap of paper from my clerk, certifying they had so many scrip, which he had counted, and he brought the money into my room with that memorandum, and then he had the new scrip.

16313. Where did you migrate to after you came to Westminster?—4, Bridge-street, Westminster.

16314. Close by here?—Yes.

16315. Have you a board-room there?—Yes.

16316. And you have a room?—Yes.

16317. And a clerk's room?—Yes.

16318. Was this business done in your room here?—In the same way as in the city.

16319. You keep a cash-book—Yes.

16320. And a pass-book and a ledger, in the second case as in the first?—They are the same books.

16321. Have you retained the talons of those certificates?—Yes.

16322. Did you make an entry of the date upon the talon?—No, I did not.

16323. Have you got one of those books here?—No, I have not; the margin contains the number of the allotment, the number of shares, the name of the party who signed the deed, and his residence.

16324. Now this blue one would not contain the number of the allotment?—No; it would contain the number of the bankers' receipt.

16325. That would furnish the date?—Yes, the day he paid his money in; but they did not invariably come to me immediately afterwards.

16326. Then in fact I understand you to say that you could not learn from the talon the day when the certificate was granted?—No.

16327. And with reference to all the business done after the bankers' limit had expired, there was no date?—There was no date upon either of them; there was no difference in doing the business whatever.

16328. There was no date entered upon the talon whatever?—No.

16329. But you kept a cash-book?—Yes.

16330. Is that a journal or waste-book?—Yes.

16331. And entries of the sums received were made in that book from day to day?—Yes.

16332. That book would show you the amount of shares subscribed for, and in consequence the certificates issued on particular days?—No, it would not.

16333. I am considering what took place after the second limit; if a man came with 100 *l.* with his 20 white certificates, would it not follow that he got 20 of the blue certificates?—Yes.

16334. Would that be entered in the cash-book?—Yes.

16335. And entered to the credit of the company?—Yes.

16336. Could not you infer with perfect accuracy from that the number of certificates issued on a particular day?—Yes.

16337. But not the dates of those certificates?—No.

16338. The cash-book is in the room?—Yes, it is.

16338*. Just allow me to look at it? [*The book was handed to Mr. Austin.*]

16339. You are acquainted with the names in the printed paper?—Yes.

16340. Will the deposits paid upon all the names in the printed railway subscription contract appear on the debit side of the cash-book?—No, they will not.

16341. Where do you stop; is it at Benjamin Davis?—That was a payment at Brighton.

16342. Are any of the names on page 5 of the printed subscription contract in this cash-book?—Yes.

16343. And the shares are there too?—Yes; but not in this order.

16344. Does that represent the sums of money, or number of shares?—Sums of money.

The Witness explained the book to Mr. Austin.

Mr.

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to Mr. *Leman* looking at the cash-book of the company, and inquired whether the fairer way would not be for Mr. Austin to proceed to impugn some name, without going on fishing through this book, and endeavouring to ascertain from it whether he can support any allegation in his petition, and whether he ought not to have been prepared with evidence to support the charges in the petition.

Mr. *Austin* stated that he was looking at the book for the very purpose of saving the time of the Committee.

The *Chairman* stated, that if the information was to be elicited by a number of questions, which might be the most regular way, it would probably take a very long time, and therefore, perhaps, the best way would be to proceed in the course that Mr. Austin was pursuing.

16345. Mr. *Austin.*] When was this deed deposited?—I am sure I do not know; the 2nd of February, I am informed.

16346. The deed of which the printed copy is an account?—I do not know; I have not looked at it.

The *Chairman* stated that the Committee would consider the list printed by order of the House an authentic document.

16347. Mr. *Austin.*] Do you mean to say that Mr. Davis, whose name appears here as a subscriber for 80 shares, is the same Davis that appears here for 80 shares?—Yes.

16348. Explain how Mr. Davis's name, which appears in the cash-book as a subscriber for 80 shares by paying 80 *l.*, is stated to have paid it the 9th of May, the deed having been lodged in February last?—He signed the deed at Brighton; he is a gentleman living at Brighton, he signed it there, and he did not apply to me for his new scrip until the day there mentioned, when he paid the money.

16349. Do you explain every one of the entries from February the 2d, beginning G. A. Sharp to B. Davis, in that manner?—No; but most of them are persons who have subscribed since the 2d of February.

16350. Do their names appear in this printed deed?—I do not know.

16351. I can inform you that they do; and it being the fact that those names do occur in this book, will you be so good as to explain. I take, for instance, B. W. Poulton, the 13th of February, 400 *l.*; how do you explain that?—I explain it in this way, that he paid it in a few days before that, but the entry is not made in the cash-book until our bankers' book was made up; and in many cases it happened, when parties came in to pay their money, it was locked up in my safe, and not paid in the same day.

16352. I thought you told me that the original of the cash-book was the journal or day-book?—Yes.

16353. That is the first book in which the transactions are entered in the office?—No, it is not.

16354. What is the first book?—The share-book is the first book.

16355. Which is that?—Such a book as that [*exhibiting one*].

16356. Where is this book for the second company, or does this contain it?—Here it is [*producing another book*].

16357. Find the first entry of Poulton's 400 *l.*?—This is the share-book.

16358. *Chairman.*] Turn to the book in which the first entry is made of that 400 *l.*—That is the receipt [*producing a paper*].

16358*. Mr. *Austin.*] Let me look at it?—[*It was handed to Mr. Austin*].

16359. Is that the first?—Yes, it is; this is the receipt that was given to him when he paid his money.

16360. That is the first document produced with regard to that 400 *l.*?—Yes, it is.

16361. Only let us be sure of that?—Yes, it is.

16362. First of all, the date is "London, the 28th of November 1836," that was written there?—Yes.

16363. That November 1836 is erased, and the word "January 1837" is inserted over it?—Yes.

16364. What is the meaning of that?—The reason why November 1836 appears there is this, that in order to facilitate the business of the bankers, my

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

clerks filled up the receipts in books of receipts, except the day, and they filled them all up November, considering, I suppose, at that time, that they would be paid in November, or that they might at least; and when parties came afterwards I was obliged to use the same receipt, and I ran my pen through November, and put over whatever the month of the year was.

16365. You mean to state that January was the date at which you actually gave the receipt?—Yes.

16366. That there is no doubt of?—No.

16367. I am clearly to understand that the money was paid and certificates given to Poulton on the 28th of January 1837?—Yes.

16368. January was not put in the same way by accident, and allowed to remain there?—It was not by accident at all.

16369. The receipt runs thus: "Received on account of the trustees for this undertaking the sum of 400*l.*, being the increased" (which word is interlined) "deposit of 2*l.*" (altered to 1*l.*) "per share on 400 shares, allotted to" (struck out) "and held by" (inserted) "B. W. Poulton, for Messrs. Hankey & Co., H. Dean." These receipts were printed for the first company?—Yes.

16370. Now where do you find the entry of 400*l.*, the amount of Poulton's deposit, in any other book?—On the 13th of February, when it was paid into the bankers'.

16371. That is your credit with your bankers?—Yes.

16372. Was it paid in in that form by you or Poulton?—No, by me.

16373. Did you pay it in from the check, or any memorandum of your own?—No, I kept a memorandum in my strong box; I made a rough memorandum of the names.

16374. And paid in the sums accordingly?—Yes.

16375. I want to know how the name got into the cash-book?—From here, the bankers' pass-book.

16376. How was it you did not transfer the date of the receipt?—The cash-book is copied from the bankers' book.

16377. Do I understand you to apply the same explanation to all the names on the debtors' side down to B. Davis?—No, I could not undertake to do that. If you will ask me any name or names, I will tell you. I have explained to you that several of the names are real and *bonâ fide* subscribers since the 2d of February, since we came to Bridge-street.

16378. You do not allude to any names printed in that document?—I do not allude to any name at all; I do not know anything of the names; I know that many of the printed lists are wrong.

16379. But that is a copy of some document lodged in February?—That does not follow, because I know some are not correct.

16380. Now then do I understand you to say there are names entered on the debtor side of this cash-book of persons who subscribed after the deed was lodged?—Yes, certainly.

16381. Just have the goodness to point them out, because that is the drift of all this examination?—February the 2d is the day the deed was lodged, and that begins February the 4th, and it would follow that all those parties would be subscribers since the 2d of February, with the exception of any one or two that may happen to be there who subscribed before, and who came afterwards for their scrip.

16382. Now apply that; and take that book, and show me those who actually subscribed after the 2d of February?—I do not know that I can tell by looking over that.

16383. Have you anything by which you can tell?—The deed will show.

16384. Then am I to take this answer, that all the persons who appear as subscribers upon the deed subscribed before the 2d of February, whatever the date may be attached to it in that book?—No.

16385. *Chairman.*] Is there on the deed the date on which each party signed?—No.

The Witness was directed to furnish a return of the names of all the subscribers, with the sums that they subscribed, which are entered in the cash-book, and who became subscribers after the 2d of February.

A number of other receipts were handed to Mr. Austin.

16386. Mr. *Austin.*] Look at that [*handing a receipt to the Witness*]; who is the

the party on whose account that receipt was made?—William Peters, the man whose name it bears.

16387. You spoke just now of a book we call the register; how was that register made out?—Speaking of the new company; this is it.

16388. How was it made?—It contains the number of new scrip certificates, the name and address of the person to whom they were issued, the number of certificates of five shares each, the number of them from such a number to such a number, the number of the bankers' receipt, and the number of the old scrip brought in and exchanged.

16389. Does it contain any dates?—No, it does not.

16390. Do you know Samuel Carr?—I know him personally, by sight, now.

16391. Do you recollect his coming with his certificates?—Yes, I recollect his person; he has been brought to my knowledge lately.

16392. Do you recollect his coming?—Yes; he came twice to my office.

16393. He signed for a very large amount?—He did.

16394. Had you known him before?—Not at all.

16395. You had never seen him till he came?—No; or heard of him.

16396. You had never heard of him?—No.

16397. Was he a subscriber to the old deed?—No, he was not.

16398. Did you know that at the time?—No; I did not think about it at the time.

16399. It was a matter you never inquired into in the case of any individual?—No.

16400. Whether they subscribed for large sums or small?—No.

16401. Do you recollect who came with Carr?—A gentleman came, whom I have since known to be of the name of Huckvale; but I did not know him then.

16402. What occasion are you now speaking of?—The first.

16403. How many shares did he apply for on the first occasion?—819; I am speaking of the applications made to the bankers.

16404. When was that?—I think it was the 17th January.

16405. Was Huckvale with him then?—Yes, to the best of my recollection, he was. I ought to say for myself, in this stage of the business, that the 17th and 18th days of January were the two last days of the limit, and I was extremely pressed; but, to the best of my recollection, Huckvale did come; but if he said he did not, I should not contradict him.

16406. When did he come for the 500 shares?—The day afterwards.

16407. Did you know him again?—I dare say I did; but I had a very large concourse of people come to me those two days.

16408. In what room was the application made for the 819 shares?—In my room.

16409. Who were there at the time?—Myself only; nobody belonging to the company were there; there might have been other applicants.

16410. Do you remember who produced the white scrip?—Carr did; I am speaking of the first time altogether, the 819 shares.

16411. Carr produced the certificates?—Yes.

16412. And the money?—Yes; and the money.

16413. What part did Huckvale take in the transaction?—He merely came as a companion, as a great number of other persons who applied to me did. It has happened very often to me, that gentlemen have come accompanied by their brokers, often and often; and when Mr. Huckvale walked in, I did not inquire who he was.

16414. Did you take Mr. Huckvale to be a broker?—No; he might be his friend. I did not inquire.

16415. He came accompanied by Mr. Huckvale the second day?—I think he did.

16416. In what way did he pay the money the first day, do you recollect?—In bank notes.

16417. Which he produced himself?—To the best of my recollection, I saw them in his hand. I will explain the mode in this particular case: when the business was done in my room, the gentleman came in and stated, producing a certain number of old scrip——

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

16418. In this case, are you speaking of?—Yes; I am going to mention this particular case.

16419. Use Mr. Carr's name?—Mr. Carr came in accompanied by another person, producing a certain quantity of scrip, and said he had come to sign the deed, and pay the increased deposit, and return the old scrip and get the new: the course of business adopted was, to desire him to go into the clerk's office where the deeds were, and in whose presence they were executed, and to take his old scrip; and the clerk's orders were to witness the signature to the deed, and to count the old scrip, and see there were as many shares as the man had signed for, and he wrote on a piece of paper, Mr. so-and-so has signed for so many shares, and has brought so many scrip, which the party brought in to me with the money, and he got the new scrip.

16420. You are wandering from the case of Mr. Carr?—No; I am speaking of Mr. Carr.

16421. Did you give the new scrip to Mr. Carr?—I suppose I did.

16422. Did you?—I am satisfied about it, and I have got his receipt here; and if I had any doubt about it, this would satisfy me.

16423. Do you speak from the receipt or your recollection?—The transaction I have a perfect recollection of.

16424. You gave the certificates to Mr. Carr?—I should say so.

16425. Are you positive about it?—I have no reason to believe the course differed in this case of Mr. Carr from others, or the man I believe to be Carr; I did not know him from Adam.

16426. In what way did the transaction take place on the second day?—In precisely the same way.

16427. After the parties had signed for these sums, did it occur to you to make any inquiry?—No, it did not; I did not think anything more about them until their names were brought before the public.

16428. No inquiries were made?—No.

16429. After he had signed for 107,000*l.*, you made no inquiry after him?—No; but it was not all paid to me; a great deal was paid to the bankers.

16430. The 819 shares were paid for to you?—Yes.

16431. You made no inquiry?—I do not know what inquiry I could make.

16432. Did he give you his address?—Yes.

16433. Did you make any inquiry at that address?—It was not possible. A man brings his old scrip, and takes his new scrip, and if I had chosen to make any inquiry about the man, on the 17th or 18th of January, I must have neglected the company's business.

16434. I am not speaking of those days only; have you made any inquiries after him since?—No.

16435. Nor the directors, nor any one to your knowledge?—No; not to my knowledge.

16436. And the same has been the case with Poulton and others?—Yes; I am not aware of any distinction whatever.

16437. Mr. Swabey is one of your directors?—Yes.

16438. Mr. Crowley?—Yes.

16439. Joseph Wilkes, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Harman, and Mr. Davis?—Yes.

16440. They are all directors?—Yes.

16441. Is Mr. Crosthwaite a director?—No.

16442. Is Mr. Sutton?—Yes.

16443. When did Messrs. Swabey, Crowley, Wilkes, Robinson, and Harman subscribe the large sums opposite their names?—I think, the 28th of January; the day we left the city.

16444. Has Mr. Swabey, or Mr. Harman, or Mr. Davis, or either of them, subscribed since the 2d of February?—No.

16445. They have not?—I think not, to the best of my recollection.

16446. Are you quite sure of it?—I would rather look over the deed. [*The Witness referred to the deed.*] Mr. Sutton has; he has subscribed for 85 shares.

16447. When?—I cannot tell what day; but since that time.

16448. Has Mr. Swabey subscribed since?—No; but Joseph Wilkes has, for 25 shares.

16449. You do not know when?—I do not know the date; there is no date since that time.

16450. John Harman?—No.

16451. Mr. Crowley, has he?—No.

16452. Is Mr. Heaviside one of your directors?—Yes.

16453. Has he subscribed since?—No.

16454. Mr. Robertson?—He has not signed since.

16455. Is Mr. Robertson a director?—No, he is not.

16456. I find that the persons, whose names I have enumerated are subscribers to a large amount?—Yes.

16457. And that the money they paid, or the cheques, were of large amounts?—Yes.

16458. £. 300, 400 *l.*, and 450 *l.*, and sums of that sort; I find that several of them were paid in on May the 4th, 5th, and 9th?—Yes.

16459. Do you mean you kept their cheques from January the 28th till May the 9th?—No, I do not.

16460. You did not hold their money all that time?—No.

16461. What did you do with it?—I did not receive their cheques till they wanted their new scrip.

16462. At the time these gentlemen signed the deed, they paid no deposit?—No; they did not on that day.

16463. Then the names of those gentlemen that I have read to you, and who have so signed for these large sums, on the 28th of January, did not pay their deposits in; that is, Mr. Wilkes did not till the 4th of May; Mr. Swabey, the 5th, and Mr. Harman, till the 9th of May; is that so?—No; I might have had their cheques a few days, but not long.

16464. Is not that after the petition that has been read, after Till's and Stephens' petitions were presented to the House?—I do not know when they were presented.

16465. Did you hear of it being presented the morning after?—I saw it in the Votes the next morning, when it was printed.

16466. Were not some sums paid after you saw that petition printed in the Votes?—I do not recollect.

16467. Was not it so?—It might have been so; I do not recollect the day at all.

16468. Those are directors of the company, the names I have read to you?—Yes.

16469. Do you mean to say that you do not remember whether those gentlemen paid the deposit-money after those petitions had been presented?—No; I do not know exactly the day.

16470. Do you know how much Mr. Swabey subscribes for in the whole; is it not 36,000 *l.*?—I do not know; this book will tell you how many shares; I think it is 490 shares.

16471. Now, then, I find by looking at the book, and putting these questions, that there are a certain number of persons who signed for large amounts, and were permitted to sign without paying the deposits?—Yes, at that time.

16472. Who were permitted to sign without paying the deposits?—Yes.

16473. Is not that true of all the names I have read to you, Mr. Swabey, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Wilkes, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Harman, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Robert Sutton?—I do not know, without referring to the book.

16474. Just look at the book? [*A book was handed to the Witness*]—I think they were.

16475. Were they the only persons who were permitted to sign the deed without paying the deposit?—Yes, I think so, with the exception of a man of the name of Peters.

16476. Now, recollect; do you mean to state that, with the exception of Peters, the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned to you were the only persons who signed the deed without paying the deposit?—Yes, at that time; I have already stated about Mr. Poulton, he paid the 400 *l.* the 28th of January.

16477. Did he sign the deed at the same time?—He signed the deed for 510 shares at once.

16478. Was that at the time he paid the money?—No; that was the 18th.

16479. Did he pay the money then?—He paid part then and part the 28th.

16480. How did he pay it?—In bank notes.

16481. Were you present when he paid it?—Yes.

16482. Did Poulton pay it himself?—I really did not know him personally.

 16483. *Chairman.*]

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

16483. *Chairman.*] A person calling himself Poulton?—A person representing himself to be Poulton, to the best of my recollection, paid the first sum; it was paid the day the deed was signed, but whether he or anybody for him brought my receipt to him over to me when the second sum was paid, I do not recollect; it might be him or somebody else, but it appears here that a person of the name of Huckvale did it.

16484. Did what?—Came for the scrip.

16485. For Mr. Poulton's scrip?—Yes; it was a very common case that one man came for another's scrip.

16486. When did Mr. Huckvale come for Mr. Poulton's scrip?—The day it is dated.

16487. What is that day?—The 28th of January.

16488. Was it the 28th of January?—Yes, it was.

16489. And you delivered the scrip to Mr. Huckvale?—If he was the man that came.

16490. Do you not know?—No.

16491. How came you to do so?—Because he brought me my receipt and signed the deed.

16492. Was he a person that represented himself to be Huckvale?—Yes; he signed "For B. W. Poulton, Robert Huckvale."

16493. And to that person you gave the scrip?—Yes.

16494. Did you not recollect that person as being the person that came with Carr?—I do not recollect whether I did or did not recollect it.

16495. Did he bring a note from Poulton?—No.

16496. Did he produce any authority to receive the scrip?—Nothing but my receipt; the bankers' receipt, I mean.

16497. Do I understand that whenever a person produced your receipt he received scrip in exchange?—Yes; if the deed had been previously signed, and the old scrip lodged.

16498. If the deed was signed and the old scrip certificate lodged, do you mean that you gave the new certificate to any person that produced the receipt?—Yes, if they brought the money.

16499. Mr. Poulton, you say, signed the deed without the payment of the whole of the deposit?—Yes.

16500. On the 18th?—Yes.

16501. The residue was paid the 28th?—Yes.

16502. How came you to allow him to sign the deed on the 18th?—It was not an unusual thing; a man came and produced to me 510 old scrip certificates, which he lodged with me, and signed the deed; he then said, "I will take 110 now, and come in a day or two and take the other 400," leaving with me the old scrip: "I will come and redeem, or whatever you like to call it, the other 400." I gave him the 110, and he said he would come in a few days and take the other and pay for them, which he did, and I kept the old scrip.

16503. You gave the remainder of the scrip to any person who produced the receipt?—Yes.

16504. Without ascertaining whether it was the same person or not?—It was the person who produced the money.

16505. That person might have been a different person?—Yes, possibly.

16506. Did that happen in other cases; you say it commonly happened?—I said it might,

16507. You said it was not an unusual thing?—I mentioned to you two or three cases, and my word applied to those; that there were two or three cases; that man Peters was one, and Poulton was another.

16508. How many other cases were there?—I cannot call to mind.

16509. Besides the directors?—I am not speaking of those; I have answered as to them already.

16510. What others were there?—I do not recollect any others.

16511. In what form did the parties sign the deed on that occasion; was it in the usual form, as if they had paid the whole?—Yes, of course they did.

16512. So that upon the deed it would appear that they had signed for the whole amount, and according to the practice they ought to have paid the deposits upon the whole amount?—Yes.

16513. But in fact they did not?—They did not.

16514. What was Mr. Peters' case?—He was one who came and signed the deed,

deed, and brought his old scrip, 35 shares, and said he was in a great hurry, and he would come in a day or two and take the new scrip and pay for them.

16515. When did he sign the deed?—Then.

16516. Without paying?—Yes, he held the certificates: he did not come in a few days, and I subsequently applied to him upon the subject; and some time after that I got a note from him, stating he had been out of town all the time, and he would come in a day or two. Before, however, he came to me, a person whose name has been mentioned, presented a petition to the House, and when he did come to pay the money, I refused.

16517. When was that?—On the 5th of this month: when he came to me to pay his deposit, I refused it on the ground, as I stated to him very plainly, his respectability and character had been impeached in a petition to the House of Commons, presented by a man of the name of Stephens, and until he cleared that satisfactorily up, or I did it by personal inquiry, I should not allow him to pay the money or give him the new scrip; and I have satisfied myself since that he is a man of respectability and responsibility to that amount, and to a much greater extent; and I have received his money and paid it to the credit of the company at the bankers', and he has got his new scrip.

16518. When did Mr. Peters sign?—On the 18th of January, I think.

16519. When did he get his certificates?—He got them the day before yesterday; he came on the 5th and tendered the money.

16520. The 5th of this month?—This month I made personal inquiry myself; I did not leave it to anybody else.

16521. I want to know the number of persons that signed the deed in this way without paying the deposit?—There might be two or three.

16522. No more than that, besides the directors?—I think not, to the best of my recollection; but if there are any names, and you will mention them to me, I shall be happy to answer you.

16523. Just look at the book, and tell me how many of those names you see on that page, or the next one, have subscribed since the 2d of February?—I cannot tell without looking at the deed; here is no date to this.

16524. Have you any means of ascertaining what number of those persons paid their deposits by the 2d of February?—No; I have undertaken to furnish a list, made out as correctly as I can, of all those who have signed the deed since the 2d of February.

16525. I mean, who have paid their deposits before that time?—If that is compared with this book, it will show.

16526. Then, do I understand you now to say that that book will show when the money was received; do you abide by that last answer; I shall be satisfied if you do?—No, I will not; as I mentioned to you that this book shows more correctly when it was paid into the bankers'.

16527. How often did your directors meet for the purpose of transacting their business?—If you will state any particular period, I will answer your question.

16528. During the time the deed was signing?—There was a regular general board once a week; and a sub-committee of four, three of whom were a quorum, came there every day.

16529. I suppose that the business transacted in your office was submitted to them, was not it?—The business of the board, as far as it was board business, was done when I was present as secretary, and entered in a book.

16530. Was the state of the subscription list submitted to them from time to time?—Not unless they asked the question.

16531. Did they ask the question?—Occasionally.

16532. Was the deed submitted to them?—It was on the board-room table.

16533. They had access to the deed?—Yes, as directors, they had.

16534. As a matter of fact, it was upon the table?—Yes.

16535. And the cash-book?—No, that was not on the table.

16536. Had they access to that book?—Yes.

16537. And to the bankers' book?—Yes.

16538. Do you mean that the accounts were never submitted to the directors, the daily or weekly accounts?—No.

16539. Nor the balances?—No.

16540. Do you mean, that at no time the body of directors, or the sub-committee,

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

mittee, inquired into the state of the balances?—At the close of last year, the accounts were audited and the balance struck.

16541. That was when there was 8,000 *l.* deficient?—Yes.

16542. Do you mean to say, knowing that they did not afterwards inquire into the state of the accounts?—No; they have occasionally looked at the bankers' book, and the cash-book, if they thought proper.

16543. Have they done so, or were they only at liberty to do so?—They have done so occasionally.

16544. Do you mean that the accounts were left entirely with you?—Yes.

16545. And no check upon you at all?—None whatever.

16546. Did they even know the amount of the gross balance in the bankers' book, for or against them?—I might have told them, or I might not; I do not know.

16547. They were signing orders for payments?—Yes, they left that to me entirely.

16548. You did not sign the cheques?—No; I countersigned the cheques; but they left the accounts to me altogether.

16549. They signed the cheques for any amount without ascertaining the balance there was at the bankers'?—I laid them before them, and the cheques were signed pursuant to resolutions of the board, that a cheque for a certain amount should be drawn, and when signed by three trustees, it was countersigned by me.

16550. Without any knowledge of the balance in hand?—It rested with me.

16551. Were the directors made acquainted with the balance in hand?—Not by me.

16552. Am I to understand that these cheques were drawn without any reference being made by the directors to the balance in hand?—Yes, perfectly.

16553. That they signed the cheques for any amount required, without any reference to the balance in hand?—Yes.

16554. That is your deliberate answer?—It is so.

16555. And it is a fact, that upon every board-day, the cash-book and ledger, and bankers' pass-book, were not laid upon the table?—It is not so.

16556. Were they or not?—They were sometimes, and sometimes not; there was no rule upon that subject.

16557. They were sometimes laid upon the table?—Yes, they have been.

16558. Were they ever examined?—I dare say they were; but the directors were very often in the board-room, while I was in my own room.

16559. Do you mean to say that you do not know whether they were ever examined by the directors?—I do not know.

16560. Do you mean to say that the directors did not, to your knowledge, look into the bankers' book and cash-book?—No; I have stated directly the contrary. I have stated that they audited the accounts.

16561. Then do I understand you to say that, with the exception of the time when the balance was struck at the commencement of the new company, that these directors have never examined the book?—No; I have stated distinctly, in answer to a question before, that the directors individually called for the cash-book, and looked at it, and the bankers' book, and looked at it; but it was never made a formal thing at the board.

16562. Then do I understand that they have looked into it individually; have the directors as a body, or individually, ever examined the state of their account since the balance?—Yes, they have.

16563. And the bankers' book?—Yes.

16564. Have they examined the deed?—Yes, occasionally.

16565. Have they not carried their examination a little further, and compared the deed with these account books?—No, I do not think they did; they never did in my presence.

16566. You being the secretary, cannot give a direct answer to that question?—As far as my knowledge goes, my answer is direct and positive.

16567. That you do not know; in your presence, you do not know that they did, but in your absence you cannot tell what they did?—Yes.

16568. That is the answer you give?—Yes.

16569. Did you ever make any statement to the directors of the fact of parties signing the deed without paying the whole of the deposits?—Yes, I think I did; I amsure I did.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

10 May 1837.

16570. Mr. Poulton's case, for instance?—Yes.

16571. Did you communicate that to the directors?—Yes; there is no doubt of it; that is, it was a communication made to them after it was done: what I did in that case, it must be distinctly understood, or in any similar cases, I did on my own responsibility, communicating to the directors from time to time what I had done.

16572. All I want to know is this, whether you did state it to the directors?—I should think I did.

16573. Have you any doubt about it, that you stated Poulton's case to the directors before he paid the rest of the deposit?—I might have mentioned it to any single director who came into my room; I did not state it to the board generally: directors have individually come into my room; coming in or going out of the building, and I made the remark.

[The Witness withdrew.

[For Evidence, Question 16574 to Q. 16609 inclusive, *see* Third Report, p. 138.]

Jovis, 11° *die Maii*, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Henry Dean*, was again called in; and further Examined, as follows:

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

11 May 1837.

16610. Mr. *Austin.*] BE so obliging as to turn to that cash-book, and show me the place in which you have entered the names of the directors, Mr. Swabey and the rest?—They are entered in several places.

16611. There is a whole run of them in the list?—I do not know anything about the printed list; it is not correct; but I will point out the dates to you.

16612. I want the entries.—[*The Witness pointed out the entries in the book to Mr. Austin.*]

16613. I asked you some questions yesterday as to the time at which those gentlemen, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Wilkes, Mr. Davis, Mr. Sutton, and one or two more, signed the deed for the shares which stand against their names in this printed list?—They signed at different times.

16614. About what time?—With respect to those shares, I should be glad to be allowed now to explain the way in which those shares were subscribed for by the directors. On the 28th of January, this was. There was, on or about that day, between 4,000 and 5,000 old scrip certificates that had not been exchanged—that had not been returned or exchanged for the new, and the directors were very willing, before the deed was to be deposited, to increase their liabilities upon that deed; and upon their undertaking to subscribe for a portion of those shares which had so become null and void by the default of the holders, and as they did not want to take the shares to make any use of them, they did not take them. The company was not in want at the moment of the money, and it was considered there was nothing at all illegal in these gentlemen, as directors, who are all responsible men, subscribing the deed for these shares so forfeited, and paying the money upon them whenever it was either wanted or whenever they chose to take up their shares.

16615. First, to come back to my question, what time did they sign?—About the 28th of January.

16616. Were not they, in fact, signed all upon one day?—I cannot call to mind; I do not know that they were, all; I think they were.

16617. Are you speaking accurately when you say they signed the 28th of January?—Yes, or thereabout; I think, about that day.

16618. And their deposits were paid very lately?—Yes, subsequently.

16619. In this month of May?—Yes.

16620. At the time when they signed the deed did they produce any certificates of old scrip?—No; the shares they subscribed for then were a portion of a number of old scrip which had become null and void by not being brought in.

Mr. *HenryDean.*

11 May 1837.

16621. Did they produce any certificates?—No.

16622. At that time had not the certificates of old scrip which had not been produced, and had an additional pound paid upon them, become void by their resolution of January the 18th?—Yes.

16623. And absolutely null and void?—Yes.

16624. Then, do I understand you to say that these gentlemen signed the deed without the production of any certificate at all?—They did.

16625. First, I will ask you whether they are the only persons who have signed the deed without any certificate?—They are.

16626. By the advertisement or resolution you read yesterday, it had been declared by the company that parties should pay 1 *l.* upon the production of their old certificates, so as to make in the whole a call of 3 *l.*?—Yes; increasing the deposit to 3 *l.*

16627. Then if you put it in that form, you mean increasing the deposit upon shares in existence?—Upon the new shares.

16628. Upon the existing shares?—Which are the new shares.

16629. Those persons you say had no certificates?—Which persons?

16630. The directors.—For those sums last subscribed, they had not.

16631. Neither old nor new?—No; the new ones they did not take from me; because they did not at that time pay the money.

16632. Had they taken them since?—Some two or three had, but not all of them even yet.

16633. Those who have taken the new shares have subscribed how much in the shape of deposit?—The whole sum.

16634. Do you mean to say that they have paid 3 *l.* apiece?—No; they have paid 1 *l.*

16635. Then they have not paid 2 *l.* upon the old certificates, but they have got the new certificates upon the payment of 1 *l.* only?—Yes.

16636. To what amount did they subscribe altogether; have you never had the curiosity to calculate it?—2,150 shares.

16637. Translated into pounds, what would that be?—It is 161,000 *l.*

16638. Is Mr. Sutton the Mr. Sutton of the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

16639. At that time had you heard any inquiries about Mr. Carr?—No.

16640. Had his name ever been mentioned?—Not to my recollection.

16641. Nor about Mr. Poulton?—Nor about Mr. Poulton.

16642. His name had not been mentioned?—No.

16643. What was the price of your scrip in the market then?—I am sure I cannot tell you.

16644. Do you not keep a journal of that sort?—No.

16645. Do you not keep a thermometer of that description?—I never troubled my head about it.

16646. Were they saleable at that time?—I do not know; I suppose anything is saleable in London.

16647. At a discount?—Yes, they may have been.

16648. Have they not been at a discount?—Yes, they have.

16649. I am speaking about the time that the batch of directors subscribed; what was the price of shares at that period?—I do not remember.

16650. Was not it low?—I do not know.

16651. Was not it selling at a heavy discount?—It was selling at a discount.

16652. At a heavy discount?—Yes, it was.

16653. Had there not been considerable difficulty in filling up the subscription deed some time before?—None whatever.

16654. There had been none?—None whatever.

16655. Upon the occasion of the formation of what we call the old company, the limit for subscription was fixed to three days at the bankers'?—Yes.

16656. It was originally fixed on the formation of the new company at the same period?—Yes, it was.

16657. And subsequently enlarged to the 18th of January?—It was.

16658. Why was it enlarged?—Because the directors thought fit.

16659. For what purpose?—To let the parties come in and sign. The three days was considered a very short period; it is always understood that the bankers like to have as little as possible of that sort of trouble, and the time was limited; but the parties who signed there did not exceed 2,300. The deeds were brought

to

to the office, and the subscriptions were received as long as the directors thought fit.

16660. Did not the parties come in very slowly during the second limit to put their names to the deed?—Yes, until the last limit.

16661. My question is, during the second limit, up to the 18th of January, did not the parties come in very slowly to sign the deed?—Quite the contrary; they came in uncommonly quick.

16662. When?—The 17th and 18th.

16663. That was the second limit?—Yes.

16664. When did that begin; did it begin at the end of the first limit?—No; the first limit was from the 12th to the 15th, at the bankers'; then the deeds laid at the office for signatures; then the second limit was from the beginning of January to the 18th; the advertisement was put in on the 11th.

16665. Have you produced that advertisement?—Yes.

16666. My question to you is this; from the time the deeds were removed from the bankers' to the Poultry, did not the subscribers come in very slowly?—They did not come in quickly, considering it was a long period from November to January; but a great number did come, altogether, between the 15th of November and the 12th or 13th of January, a period of two months. Looking at that period, there was not a great number of subscribers came in, to what there did afterwards; and yet there was a great number for the whole period; and upon the 17th and 18th of January a large number did come.

16667. Now be so good as to address your mind to this, and answer the question, and do not give any explanation. Did not the subscribers come in very slowly until the 1st day of January?—They did not come in in great numbers. I hardly know the meaning of slowly, as applied there.

16668. Did not a very small portion of the whole names upon the deed come in before the 1st of January?—I think there were about 5,000 subscribed in that period.

16669. *Chairman.*] Five thousand what?—Shares; I am speaking from memory.

16670. Mr. *Austin.*] About how many subscribed between the 1st and 15th of January?—I do not know that; but during the limit, or during the last two days, I think there must have been from 3,600 to 3,800.

16671. Then I understand you, upon the two last days the number was from 3,600 to 3,800?—Yes.

16672. Can you tell me how many subscribed between the 1st of January and the 16th?—No, I cannot.

16673. Was not the number subscribing on the two last days very considerably greater in proportion than the rest who had subscribed during the rest of the month?—Most certainly, and very naturally.

16674. That is a matter of inference and not evidence. Did you happen to send out any letters to any of your subscribers?—Letters; no, I do not remember having sent any.

16675. I do not mean you; but were any circulars sent?—If you will tell me what about——

16676. Were any sent?—I do not recollect any.

16677. You cannot give me the price of the shares on the 18th?—No, I cannot; except that to the best of my recollection they were much higher on the 18th and on the 28th; but what they were I do not know; that is my impression.

16678. Were they worth anything at all on the 28th?—Yes, I apprehend so.

16679. Cannot you give me something like a guess of the difference in value between the 18th and 28th?—No, I cannot; but any share-list will; from memory I cannot tell at all.

16680. Who took the subscription of the directors on the 28th?—They did not pay any on the 28th.

16681. In whose presence did they sign the deed?—In the presence of the clerk, I apprehend.

16682. I think you have told me before what the ordinary course was; this, that when the party produced the old certificate and the money, he was permitted to sign the deed?—Yes.

16683. By what order?—It was the regulation of the directors, carried into effect by me.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

11 May 1837.

16684. Do I understand you to say that you gave that order to the secretary to allow a person to sign the deed?—I am the secretary myself.

16685. Did you give the order to the person in whose custody the deed was to allow the parties to sign after they produced the certificate and the money?—Yes

16686. Could they have signed the deed without your authority?—No, it was impossible; the clerk would not have allowed them.

16687. By whose authority did the directors sign?—By their own authority.

16688. Not yours?—No; I am their servant.

16689. Did you see them all execute the deed?—I certainly did.

16690. Mr. Robinson is not a director?—Mr. Robertson is not; Mr. Robinson is.

16691. Mr. Thomas Robinson is a director, and Mr. Robertson is not?—That is the fact.

16692. They signed the deed without your interference at all?—Yes, certainly.

16693. I asked you yesterday, upon several occasions, whether this cash-book was not No. 1 of the books kept in the office, and you told me it was the journal or waste-book?—I do not think I said that the cash-book was No. 1; if I did, I did not know there was any weight attached to my saying it was No. 1; I produced the book.

16694. Did you not call it yesterday the journal, or waste-book, or day-book?—I might have said so.

16695. Did you not say it was the first book in which entries of receipts of money were made?—The cash-book usually is, and I have no doubt this was.

16696. Did you not state that this book was the book in which the entries of the receipts of money were made?—I do not know? I have not seen my evidence, and I cannot carry the whole of it in my head; but I will state, as I have no doubt I did, that it is the cash-book of the company, in which are entered their cash transactions.

16697. Was there any other book in which the receipts of money were entered before they found their way into this book?—No, there was not.

16698. Then, do I understand you correctly, and I am anxious not to make a mistake about it, that this is the first book in which any entry of cash received is made?—In our office.

16699. Speaking to the time subsequent to the first limit, when the deeds were removed from the bankers' to the Poultry, you received the money at the office?—Yes.

16700. Upon that occasion, the first entry was made in that book?—Yes, the only entry is made in that book.

16701. I asked you the question very particularly, in consequence of the dates in this book not corresponding with the subscriptions in the deed?—Yes, I recollect it.

16702. Now, considering that, do you still say in this book you made the first entries of the money received?—Yes, always.

16703. Now, be so kind as to explain to the Committee; I have read your explanation of yesterday, and I ask you to explain to the Committee how it is you can reconcile the dates put against the several payments in this book with the dates at which the parties whose names are entered in the cash-book signed the deed; here are two whole pages beginning with G. A. Sharp, and ending with B. Davis, containing the names of persons subscribing large sums of money, whom you say signed the deed January the 18th?—I think I explained that to the Committee yesterday, with respect to two or three of these cases, in answer to a question put by the learned counsel to me, as to how these dates are different, and they come within the same explanation. I stated, as there were a great number of persons who had subscribed the deed since the 2d of February, I was afraid I could not separate them, upon which a list was ordered of those persons who had signed the deed since the 2d of February, which list I have made out.

16704. Have the goodness to produce it. [*The Witness handed the following paper to Mr. Austin.*]

THE DIRECT LONDON AND BRIGHTON RAILWAY.

Names of Persons who have subscribed the Second Deed since the 2d February, with Amount subscribed.

NAMES.	Amount Subscribed.
	£.
Alexander Melville	2,250
John Jackson	5,250
W. A. Brown	1,500
John Robertson	11,250
James West, junior	7,500
W. Hanham	11,250
* R. Sutton, junior	1,125
J. S. Smith	11,250
Charles Schlotel	3,975
James Lawson	30,000
J. B. Wilks	1,875
George Edmonds	5,625
Elizabeth Roberts	2,250
Michael Longstaff	7,500
R. S. Fleming	2,250
John Aspinall	1,500
* Thomas Goodall	11,250
Thomas Elliman	375
H. Harris	1,125
H. Taylor	750
£.	119,850

Those marked thus * are also subscribers prior to the 2d February.

16705. Now, have you got the minute-books here?—Yes.

16706. Just find me the minute-book corresponding with these entries from the 2d of February to March?—They are not there; the minute-books are a history of the company when they are assembled at the board, and have nothing to do with the shares.

16707. Just give me the book containing the minutes from the 2d of February to the 9th of May?—

16708. *Chairman.*] Were there two separate books, one kept by the provisional committee and the other by the directors?—We have only one set of minute-books.

16709. Mr. *Austin.*] Just give me that minute-book. [*The minute-book was handed to Mr Austin.*] Do you find Alexander Melville's name in those two pages?—No, I do not; but I can explain that in a minute.

16710. Just take the book and tick the names.

[*The book was again handed to the Witness.*]

16711. Is Alexander Melville's name there?—Not since the 2d of February.

16712. John Jackson's name; is that in that cash-book?—Yes, his name is here.

16713. Just tick him with a pencil; is it for 5,250*l.*?—It does not state that; it states the amount of shares; it is 70 shares.

16714. Do you get the deposit there of the whole of the sum mentioned in your list?—Yes.

16715. Is W. A. Brown there?—Yes, he is.

16716. For the deposits upon 1,500*l.*?—Yes.

16717. Jackson, I find, was a subscriber to some amount before that time?—Do you mean he subscribed twice?

16718. Yes.—These names are the names who subscribed since the 2d of February, and if he has signed a second time, it must have been prior to that time.

16719. "John Robertson," do you find him in that cash-book?—Yes.

16720. For 11,250*l.*?—Yes.

16721. "James

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

11 May 1837.

16721. "James West, junior"?—No; but before we go any further, John Robertson, it appears in this book, paid in 400*l.*, on account of himself, West, jun. and Hanham.

16722. What sum would the 400*l.* represent?—The sum total of those three names upon that paper.

16723. You have got them all in a lump?—Yes; the payment.

16724. How do you know that the entry there includes those three names?—Because they are the same parties who signed the deed, and for whom he paid.

16725. That does not appear in the cash-book?—I am explaining it.

16726. How do you know that that applies to this?—Because when he paid it in he included it.

16727. He mentioned it?—Yes, he did.

16728. You recollect it?—Yes.

16729. Is "R. Sutton, junior," there?—Yes.

16730. He is for 1,125?—He is in two places, then.

16731. What have you got him for?—£. 140; that would be for 140 shares.

16732. That would be for a great deal more than this?—I think there is an explanation necessary there.

16733. What is the sum?—It is 140*l.*, paid the 11th of February.

16734. Now mention the explanation; it is very likely you have left out a nought in the return; he is among the very large sums?—The explanation is this; that the 140*l.* will probably turn out, if paid in one sum, to be what was paid on account of the subscription prior to the 2d of February, and therefore he had no business to be there.

16735. You only suggest that as an explanation?—Yes.

16736. Do you find J. Smith?—Yes.

16737. How much?—£. 11,250.

86738. "Charles Schlotel, 3,975*l.*?"—Yes.

16739. "James Lawson?"—Yes.

16740. £. 30,000?—Yes, 400 shares.

16741. "J. B. Wilks?"—Yes.

16742. £. 1,875?—No, there is 72*l.* to him that is subject to the same explanation; he subscribed for 25 shares after the 2d of February.

16743. "George Edmonds," do you find him there?—Yes.

17644. For 5,625*l.*?—Yes, that is right.

17645. "Elizabeth Roberts?"—Yes.

16746. £. 2,250?—Yes.

16747. "Michael Longstaff, 7,500*l.*?"—Yes, that is right.

16748. "R. S. Fleming?"—Yes.

16749. £. 2,250?—Yes.

16750. "John Aspinall?"—Yes.

16751. £. 1,500?—Yes.

16752. "Thomas Goodall?"—Yes.

16753. How much, 11,250*l.*?—I have got him for 150 shares.

16754. "Thomas Elliman," is he there?—Not after the 2d of February; he is the same as Mr. Melville, about whom you would not let me explain.

16755. "H. Harris?"—He is here.

16756. How much?—Fifteen shares; whatever is there, the calculations are correct.

16757. "H. Taylor?"—He is under the same circumstances as the other two.

16758. He is not here?—No, not since the 2d of February.

16759. He is not in this book?—Not in these two pages.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated that Mr. Austin had no right to take as for granted the fact, namely, that the 20 names on the papers are not to be found in that book as subscribers after the 2d of February, without taking the explanation that the Witness offers as to how it arose.

The *Chairman* stated, when the returns were received the matter would be rendered clear, and Mr. Clarkson should have plenty of opportunities of explaining it.

Mr. *Clarkson* begged for the decision of the Committee upon this point, whether the explanation was to be given by the Witness now or not.

The *Chairman* stated that the explanation could be given upon cross-examination.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated that the usual course was to allow a witness, after he

he had answered the question as to the fact, to give any explanation he thought proper.

The *Chairman* stated that the Committee had agreed that Mr. Austin should proceed in his examination.

16760. Mr. *Austin.*] When was the deed deposited?—On the 2d of February.

16761. When did you receive Mr. Sharp's money, which is entered here as the 2d of February?—Perhaps about the last day of January, probably.

16762. You received of G. A. Sharp 100*l.*, probably the last day of January?—Yes.

16763. And "R. Sutton, junior;" when did you receive that 100*l.*, entered as the 4th of February?—About the 1st or 2d of February; I think those sums were paid at the office in Bridge-street, Westminster; and it was generally the second day at the soonest that the money was paid into the bankers'.

16764. "William Spencer, 130*l.*," the same day?—Yes, if it is the 4th.

16765. "B. W. Franklin;" the same date?—It would be the same day.

16766. "E. Northcote, per Hankey & Co., 20*l.*;" the same day?—That we paid into the bankers'.

16767. "G. J. Rennie, 50*l.*;" entered the 13th of February; when did you receive that?—Two or three days before.

16768. "B. W. Poulton, 400*l.*;" entered as the 13th of February?—It was paid the 28th of January, as I showed you yesterday by the receipt.

16769. William Spencer again, 70*l.*; entered as of the 14th of March; when did you receive that money?—It would be about the 12th of March; I am speaking from memory.

16770. Accordingly you put in the word about?—Yes.

16771. "Thomas Goodall, 150*l.*;" entered as received March 17th?—That would be subject to the same deduction of two or three days.

16772. "William Kingdom, 167*l.*;" entered as the 17th of March?—About two days before.

16773. "Hills, 50*l.*;" entered as the 18th of March?—That was paid a few days before.

16774. "Briggs, 25*l.*;" entered the 18th of March?—It should be, properly, Wilkes; he paid in for him, and it should have been entered Wilkes.

16775. That was a few days before?—Yes.

16776. "J. Swabey, 40*l.*;" entered the 21st of March?—It was paid in two or three days before.

16777. "R. Heavyside, 70*l.*;" entered 6th of April?—

Mr. *Clarkson* called the attention of the Committee to what was a great grievance to the parties for whom he appeared; and he asked the Committee to determine whether the private minutes of the proceedings of the company for whom he appeared should be in the possession of one of the Counsel appearing in support of the petition, (not meaning to throw the slightest imputation upon Mr. Rowe,) while another of the Counsel was investigating into the matters of the cash accounts relating to the company.

Mr. *Alexander* claimed the right to be heard on the same side with Mr. Clarkson.

Mr. *Austin* objected to a second counsel being heard upon matters such as the present.

The *Committee* decided that Mr. Alexander could not be heard.

Mr. *Rowe* was heard in answer to the objection of Mr. Clarkson, and stated that his examination of the minute-book was directed to the very point into which Mr. Austin was examining from the cash-book.

The *Chairman* stated that the course adopted in the preceding inquiries was not to allow the counsel on the opposite side to have possession of the books; but that the officers of the company had been called, and asked whether there was any entry upon the particular subject at that time under inquiry; but the Chairman suggested, if there was a little mutual indulgence, the time of the Committee might be saved. At the same time, if an objection was taken, the Committee would decide that the books ought not to be in the possession of the counsel of the opposing side.

The book was returned to the counsel appearing for the company.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

11 May 1837.

16778. Mr. *Austin.*] When did you receive that money of Heavyside?—It was paid into the bankers' at Brighton.

16779. Then you had it at Brighton?—Yes.

16780. You cannot tell when it was received?—No, not exactly.

16781. "William Lynn, 39*l.*," entered the 12th April; when was that paid?—It is subject to the same explanation as the other, two days before.

16782. "John Harman, 250*l.*," 24th of April?—I should wish to make a remark upon that. Mr. Harman, in point of fact, paid 200*l.* of that money about the 22d or 23d of December, by a cheque which he gave me on his bankers, but he requested me not to present it for a few days; he was taken very ill, and nearly dying, and confined to his bed for two months, and I did not present the cheque, as I could not communicate with him, and I had no means of getting his authority to pay it in, or get another cheque, till he came down that day; but I had 50 old scrip of his before, for which he signed, and he added that, and made it 250*l.*

16783. "Robert Sutton, jun. 500*l.*," the 24th of April?—The same observation applies to that.

16784. When was that 500*l.* paid?—About a couple of days.

16785. "C. S. Crowley, 300*l.*," 27th of April?—It was paid two days before.

16786. "Edward Owen, 50*l.*," 29th of April: was that paid about the same time?—Yes.

16787. "Warner, 50*l.*," the 3d of May?—It was paid some days before.

16788. "J. B. Wilkes, 300*l.*," the 4th of May?—That would be about two days before.

16789. "John Swabey, 450*l.*," the 5th of May; when was that paid?—Two or three days before; but a part of it is liable to the same explanation I have just given as to Mr. Harman; 200*l.* of it he paid about the 27th or 28th of January in like manner, and asked me not to present the cheque for a few days; he was called out of town, and staid a long time, and he then gave me a cheque for the whole.

16790. "John Harman, 300*l.*" 9th of May?—That was paid about the 7th of May: no, it was rather earlier.

16791. In May?—No, about the 25th of April; I held it a few days.

16792. "B. Davis, 80*l.*," on the 9th of May?—That would be about the 7th.

16793. Now you have handed in a list entitled, "A List of the Names of Persons who have subscribed the Second Deed since the 2d of February, with the Amount subscribed"?—Yes.

16794. Those names appear in these pages of the cash-book commencing the 2d of February; I have asked you no questions as to those names; with respect to those names as to which I have asked you questions, you have told me in all the cases they paid the money in about two or three days before the day mentioned in the cash-book?—Yes, except as I have mentioned.

16795. Nevertheless those parties signed the deed before it was deposited; is not that so?—Yes, exactly.

16796. That is, is it true, or is it not true, that all those persons who have been so mentioned were permitted to sign the deed without paying the deposit?—Yes, at the time; but they all brought in their old scrip at the time, and lodged it with me.

16797. Now be so kind as to attend to this; yesterday I did put this question to you: "I want to know the number of persons who signed the deed in this way without paying the deposit?" "There might be two or three," was your answer then. "No more than that, besides the directors?" "I think not, to the best of recollection; but if there are any names, and you will mention them to me, I shall be happy to answer you." "Just look at the book and tell me how many names you see on that page, or the next, who have subscribed since the 2d day of February?" "I cannot tell without looking at the deed; here is no date to this." Now you were inaccurate in that answer yesterday, as to two or three; and, in fact, all the parties I have now mentioned to you were permitted to sign the deed without paying the deposit?—Yes, without paying at the time.

16798. By what authority did you permit those persons to sign the deed without paying the deposit?—By my own, I did not require any authority.

16799. Did you state the fact to the directors at any time, or to any of them?—I have no doubt I mentioned it.

16800. You have no doubt that they were aware that those persons, or some of them, had been permitted to sign the deed without paying the deposit?—They had been permitted to sign the deed by lodging with me their old scrip, and not receiving their new till they came, as they said they would do, and paid for it.

16801. The scrip at that very time being forfeited scrip?—No.

16802. Null and void, by the previous advertisement?—No.

16803. This was after the 18th of January?—I understood your question to relate to the parties who were allowed to subscribe the deed prior to the 2d of February, but who did not at the time they subscribed pay the deposit; my answer to that is, that those parties who had so subscribed the deed were permitted to do it on bringing to me and lodging in my hand the old scrip, and not taking the new scrip until they brought their money.

16804. Then, do I understand you to say, that all those parties whose names have been mentioned in detail, and who did not pay until the respective periods set against their names, or thereabout, were parties who signed the deed before the 18th of January?—Some did and some did not.

16805. About how many did, and how many did not; can you give me any statement?—I have given you a list of those who have signed since the 2d of February.

16806. How many signed before, and how many signed after the 18th of January, whose names have been mentioned to you in detail?—They all signed before the 2d of February.

16807. How many of the persons whom you permitted to sign by your authority without paying the deposit signed before the 18th of January, and how many afterwards?—I do not think I could tell that from memory.

16808. Did they sign before or did they sign after Poulton?—[*The Witness referred to the book.*] It is quite impossible for me to answer the question from this book, and I will state, with a view to explaining, why I cannot answer it: I am very desirous of answering it, and if I can, I will. This payment of 500*l.* of Robert Sutton covered two or three subscriptions, at two or three different times.

16809. How were the names put down in the deed; do they follow in succession according to the dates; though no date is attached, I should presume they would. Just consider: a man comes on Monday with 1*l.*, he would put it down on that day; if a man came on Wednesday, it would appear posterior?—I do not understand the question. If the question is, that a man's name appears on the deed, and did he come a particular day to sign the deed, I should say yes; but as there is no date to the deed, I cannot say.

16810. *Chairman.*] Do the names appear on the deed in the order in which they signed, or was space left after one name before another was attached?—No; they signed in the order in which they stand upon the deed.

16811. Mr. *Austin.*] Then, if you can fix the date of any man's signature, you can give a probable answer as to the rest.

16812. *Chairman.*] You can say whether he signed before or after a certain date. If you can fix the date at which any one person signed, you can say that all that stand before him signed before that date, and all that stand after him, afterwards?—I have just mentioned one gentleman's payment of 500*l.*, that appears to have been paid after the 2d of February; but the subscription to the deed was a considerable time before.

16813. We are only talking of the date on which the parties signed the deed.

16814. Mr. *Austin.*] Just look at this, the printed railway subscription contract, page 4, "Benjamin Wheeler Poulton;" suppose this to be an accurate representation of the deed at present, would not those below Poulton's name have been signed at some period after Poulton?—Yes, certainly.

16815. You have pointed out Mr. Heavyside as the only one who signed at Brighton?—Yes.

16816. Should you not say that all those persons not ticked off signed the deed after Mr. Poulton?—No, for the reason I have stated.

16817. Look at that book, and tell me how many of those names not ticked are in the situation of Mr. Sutton, who had paid *nunc pro tunc?*—Here is the name of Spencer, a few names below Mr. Poulton, who paid 70*l.*

16818. He paid two sums?—Yes, he signed for the whole sum at once; but whether he signed before or after Mr. Poulton, or Mr. anybody else, I cannot tell.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

11 May 1837.

16819. How many of those names are in that predicament; Spencer is like Sutton?—Yes.

16820. How many other persons are there who stand in Sutton's case?—1,512.

16821. To whom you cannot say whether they signed the deed before or after the 18th of January?—No, I cannot; but it was before the 2d of February.

16822. It is quite clear that some of them signed after the 18th of January, did they not?—Yes, I have no doubt about it.

16823. You have no doubt some signed after the 18th of January, upon the production of the certificates and upon payment of the deposits?—Yes; they having applied first to the directors, and stated the matter satisfactorily to the directors, they permitted them to come and do it after the 18th.

16824. Is that so?—Yes.

16825. Was there any minute made upon that subject?—Yes.

16826. In all those cases the scrip would become forfeited were they signed after the 18th of January?—No.

16827. The 18th of January instant?—That was the advertisement; and I have just stated, in special cases, persons applying after the 18th, the directors thought it was a hard case, and they allowed them to come to exchange the scrip.

16828. Was not Mr. Poulton's one of those cases?—No.

16829. Did he not come the 28th?—Yes; but he had signed it before.

16830. When?—The 18th of January, and lodged the scrip for the whole amount that he signed for.

16831. Was he permitted to lodge the scrip without paying the deposit by the act of the directors or yours?—By mine.

16832. Which you communicated to the directors?—I have no doubt I did, or to one of them; I have stated, during the latter days of the limit in January, the directors were sitting in the board-room, and I was sitting in my room to do this work, which occupied my whole time.

16833. Mr. Sutton, whose case you have selected as a peculiar one, has paid three times since the 2d of February; on the 24th of April 500*l.*, which I see is for 200 shares, 70 shares, and 250 shares?—That would make it more.

16834. Than the money in your book?—Yes; therefore I select that case to show you that it is impossible for me to tell what amount of subscription at any particular time that 500*l.* includes; but if you wish to know it, I will dissect it, as well as the rest, if you will give me time to do it; he signed altogether for 900 and some odd shares; and he had previously paid upon them less 500*l.*, which he paid the other day; but to which of the signatures that 500*l.* is applicable I cannot say.

16835. Will you allow me to ask you this question: how is it that in this cash-book, being the first book in which an entry appears of the payment of money, that an entry was not made of the actual day of payment?—I think I explained it to you yesterday; I will do it again: in very many cases they were put in, but generally speaking the monies paid at the office were sent to the bankers' by me from time to time, and when the bankers' book was filled up and sent back, the entries were made from that into the cash-book.

16836. Do I understand you to say, at the time the money was paid there was no entry made?—There was not.

16837. But the money was sent to the bankers'?—Yes.

16838. Do you mean you sent to the bankers' the money paid by each person?—No; it was kept till the latter end of the day, and all sent together.

16839. That is the way in which this cash-book has been kept?—Yes, exactly.

16840. Have you got the book of talons we spoke of yesterday?—No, I have not.

16841. Messrs. Harman and Swabey were the two directors who wished their cheques not to be presented?—Yes, for a few days.

16842. They were not presented for a considerable period?—Yes, for the reasons I have mentioned.

16843. For how much did Mr. Swabey subscribe altogether?—490 shares altogether.

16844. How much would that be in money?—£.36,750.

16845. How much did Mr. Harman subscribe altogether?—650, that is 48,750*l.*

16846. I asked you some questions yesterday as to Poulton; you stated you recollected

recollected Poulton coming to the office?—Yes, or a person representing himself to be Poulton.

16847. You remember the fact now?—Yes.

16848. For how many shares did he apply?—510 shares.

16849. Did he come alone upon that occasion?—I should, in answering the question, say I that could not recollect, if it had not been that I was told yesterday Mr. Carr was there, and for the reason I gave.

16850. I think you said yesterday that Mr. Huckvale was with him?—The question was asked me, and I think I answered, or I intended to answer; if I was asked from recollection yesterday, I should say I did not recollect; but if Mr. Huckvale said he was there, I should not contradict him.

19851. Poulton did not pay all his money upon that occasion?—No; but he deposited the old scrip, which was in fact the rule, as far as these persons went; it was considered a security; the old scrip was considered a security.

16852. In this case?—In the few instances I have mentioned.

16853. When you say the rule, was it a rule of yours or of the directors?—It was a rule of mine.

16854. Then you mean it was your practice?—Yes, in those few cases it was, if you call it a practice.

16855. When did Poulton come again?—The 28th of January, as appears by the receipt; but I must beg to qualify saying he came again; because I cannot tax my memory whether he came, or whether he came alone, or anybody else brought the money and redeemed it for him.

16856. I want to know whether the person who came the second time, whoever he was, brought any authority from Poulton?—No; it appears he did not bring any authority; I cannot tell whether Poulton came with him or not, but the receipt is endorsed, "for B. W. Poulton, Huckvale." Whether those parties came together, or whether Mr. Huckvale brought his authority, I cannot charge my memory to say.

16857. Whether Mr. Huckvale paid you the money or Poulton you cannot say?—No, I cannot say in any case which particularly gave me the money.

Mr. *Clarkson* proposed to postpone his cross-examination until the examination of Mr. Dean was finally concluded, inasmuch as Mr. Austin had stated he might wish to examine him again upon some of the documents to be produced.

The Committee acceded to the course proposed.

16858. Mr. *Austin.*] You have excepted several names as being Brighton cases?—Yes.

16859. Just be so kind as to tell me very shortly what the course was as to the Brighton people?—Duplicates of the deeds were sent down to the bankers at Brighton.

16860. When?—Just before the limit, so as to be there by the time.

16861. There was the same limit there?—Yes; they had a receipt-book, and the shareholders were invited and expected to go there and sign the deed; and after the limit, as I suppose, they did the business the same as we did. It was taken to the Brighton solicitor's office, and I believe some few of the people signed there, and after some time the deeds were transmitted to London.

16862. When was the cash transmitted?—It was not transmitted; we had an account there; we drew it through the London bankers from the Brighton bankers, as we wanted it.

16863. Who can give a statement of the way in which the Brighton subscribers signed the deed and paid their money?—As far as the business at Brighton was done, it is subject to the same explanation as I have given. I called upon them for an account from time to time, and the accounts they sent to me I will produce to you, if you wish it.

16864. The account which who sent to you?—The Brighton bankers.

16865. Who can give an account of the transactions under the second limit at Brighton?—The time the deed was signed and the money paid will be shown by the account.

16866. Who stood in your situation at Brighton?—After the bankers had done, it was taken to the Brighton solicitor's office.

16867. Can the Brighton solicitor give the same account as you have done?—The Brighton solicitor or his clerk.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

11 May 1837.

16868. *Chairman.*] Who are the Brighton solicitors?—Henry Faithful is one, and Arthur Rennie Briggs is another.

16869. How is it that some of these sums which are Brighton sums have been paid to you and entered into your book?—They are all entered as soon as we get the account from Brighton.

16870. All that you know as to Mr. Heaviside is, that you received his money on the 6th of April?—I received, most likely, a letter stating that such a sum had been paid in.

16871. Can you tell, from these entries here, at what time it was paid in, or from any other book?—He probably gave a cheque upon Hall & Co. at Brighton, and then it would be paid into Hankey's by us. I do not know that that was the fact.

16872. Now as to Mr. Davis; Mr. Davis is a Brighton man; can you ascertain at what time he paid?—He paid 80*l.*; he paid that money in London; does not it state so?

16873. You have put it with a B.; I thought that meant Brighton?—He signed the deed at Brighton, and paid the money in London.

16874. He paid the money the 9th of May, or a couple of days before?—Yes.

16875. He must have signed the deed since the 2d of February?—No, that does not follow.

16876. Either he signed the deed since the 2d of February, or was allowed to sign the deed upon trust?—Yes, the same as the others; but with respect to that, I think he signed the Brighton deed, and that was a long time ago.

16877. But he must have signed in one of those two ways?—Yes; and without paying.

16878. Thomas Sinclair Robinson is a Brighton man?—Yes.

16879. He signs in the same way?—Yes.

16880. "F. B. Wilkes;" is he Brighton, 300*l.*, the 4th of May?—No, those are the subscriptions you have been speaking about; what are called the reserved shares, taken the 28th of January, and paid lately.

16881. He either signed the deed upon trust, or else he has signed the deed since February the 2d?—He has signed it and paid since.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William James Mackie*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *W. J. Mackie.*

16882. Mr. *Austin.*] WHERE do you live?—My office is with Messrs. J. & T. Moxon, Old Broad-street.

16883. Are you a clerk there?—Yes.

16884. What are Messrs. Moxon?—Stockbrokers.

16885. *Chairman.*] They are on the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

16886. Mr. *Austin.*] How old are you?—Eighteen.

16887. Did you sign Rennie's Brighton deed?—Yes, I did.

16888. When did you sign it?—I signed it twice.

16889. Where?—At Rennie's Brighton Railway office.

16890. When was that?—I have got the dates; the first time was on or about the 25th of January, and the next on or about the 6th of December.

16891. What year was that January in?—January this year.

16892. And the December of last year?—Yes.

16893. The December was first?—Yes.

16894. How old were you then?—I was between 17 and 18.

16895. How much did you sign for on the first occasion, in December?—For 30 shares; the second time for five shares.

16896. For 35 shares altogether?—Yes.

16897. Where did you get the old scrip?—It was sent up from a correspondent in the country.

16898. *Chairman.*] Are you speaking of the first lot or the second?—Both of them.

16899. Mr. *Austin.*] You got it from a correspondent in the country?—We did.

16900. Who did?—My employers; it was sent up to them.

16901. How did you get it?—It was handed over to me by my employers to pay the calls upon. [*The deed was produced, and the Witness appeared to have signed for* 25 *shares the second time.*]—I did say five, and I thought it was five.

[*The deed was shown to the Witness.*]

16902. Is

16902. Is that your signature?—Yes.

16903. Did you sign for 25?—Yes.

16904. Is that your writing?—Yes.

16905. You did not know you had signed for 25, you thought it was five?—That I take to be an error of memory.

[*The Witness appeared to have signed the deed again for* 30 *shares.*]

16906. That is four thousand and odd pounds?—Yes.

16907. For which you rendered yourself liable, did you?—Yes.

16908. Only you are not of age. You say this white scrip came from a country correspondent; I should like to know how you got it?—It was sent up from him.

16909. To whom?—To Messrs. Moxon.

16910. How did it come from Messrs. Moxon's to you?—Why, they put it into my hands to go and pay the call upon it. I do not believe that they knew I was requested to sign the deed when they gave it to me.

16911. Where did you pay the first, in December?—I believe it was paid in Rennie's Brighton office.

16912. Were any questions asked you when you produced the scrip?—Not any, to my recollection; at least I stated the circumstances.

16913. What did you state?—That I came to pay upon them; and they said the holders must sign the deed.

16914. Did you tell them for whom you came to pay?—Yes.

16915. You told them you did not come to pay for yourself?—Yes, I told them that.

16916. To whom did you make that communication?—To the gentleman that I saw there, whom I believe to be the secretary.

16917. Have you seen him about here to-day?—No, I did not.

16918. Do you recollect his name?—No, I do not; but I thought at the time he was the secretary.

19919. You believed him to be the secretary?—Yes.

16920. Did you say you told that gentleman you came to sign on behalf of Messrs. Moxon?—Yes.

16921. Or what did you tell him?—I stated I brought the scrip from them, and requested to be allowed to sign the deed.

16922. Did you request to be allowed to sign, or did he give any direction?—I requested to sign the deed as a matter of convenience.

16923. Were any directions given to you to that effect by Messrs. Moxon?—Yes.

16924. Having those directions, you told the person you saw you came to sign the deed?—Yes.

16925. I think you said you told him you had not come to sign for yourself, but for other persons?—Yes.

16926. You told the secretary that?—Yes.

16927. Did he permit you, after that statement, to sign the deed?—Yes.

16928. Did you pay the money?—I paid the draft of Messrs. Moxon.

16929. Drawn in your own name?—By them.

16930. You got the blue scrip delivered to you?—Yes.

16931. Did you go to the same place on the second occasion?—I did so.

16932. Did you carry with you at that time anything except the white scrip?—Nothing whatever except the white scrip and the draft for the payment.

16933. That was on the 25th of January?—On or about the 25th of January.

16934. Were you informed on that occasion that the scrip was forfeited?—Yes, I was so.

16935. By whom?—By the gentleman who I believe to be the secretary.

16936. The gentleman you had seen before?—Yes.

16937. What took place upon that?—I believe Messrs. Moxon had a communication with one of the directors, and the consequence was, I was sent again, when the payment was made, and the blue scrip delivered.

16938. Did you on that occasion sign the deed?—Yes, I did.

16939. In your own name?—Yes.

16940. Did the secretary know you signed the deed?—Yes; I did it in his presence, as far as my recollection will serve.

16941. Did you sign the deed the first time in the presence of the secretary?—I believe I did.

Mr. *W. J. Mackie.*

21 May 1837.

16942. What did you do with the blue certificates?—I brought them back to Messrs. Moxon's office, and delivered them to them.

16943. You did not keep them yourself?—No.

16944. Have you ever seen anything of them from that time to the present?—No, I have not, although I believe them to be held by the parties to whom they belonged at that time.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

16945. Are Messrs. Moxon & Co. stockbrokers of respectability?—They are so, I believe.

16946. I presume you were not put under any course of personal examination, by whoever it was you saw, to ascertain how old you were?—No, I was not.

16947. Is there any objection at all to disclose the name of your correspondent from whom Messrs. Moxon received the scrip?—No; I have them in my possession.

16948. Be so good as to furnish the Committee with the name of the gentleman by whom the scrip was transmitted?—The name of the gentleman, for the first parcel, was Fisher.

16949. Of where?—Of Manchester.

16950. What is he?—I am not aware of what his business is.

16951. Was he a correspondent of your house before?—Yes.

16952. How long have you been with Messrs. Moxon?—Three years.

16953. As far as you know, from your three years' experience, is Mr. Fisher a man of substance and respectability?—I believe him to be a man of respectability.

16954. You do not know anything about his property yourself?—I do not myself.

16955. Who sent the second scrip?—Mr. Fairclough of Liverpool.

16956. Was he a previous correspondent of your house?—He has been.

16957. Is he a gentleman of respectability?—He is undoubtedly so.

16958. Will you be so good as to take an opportunity of seeing the secretary, Mr. Dean?—That is the gentleman [*pointing to Mr. Dean.*]

16959. As far as you know anything of either of the transactions for which you have been acting for your employers, were they, on the part of those who transmitted the scrip, genuine and *bonâ fide* transactions?—They were.

16960. And you say, (I do not know whether the observation applies to both,) "I believe them still to be held by the parties from whom we received them"?—I believe them to be so.

16961. By what means was it you were found to be examined as a witness; who came to you?—First of all a person came who I have seen about here to-day.

16962. Perhaps you cannot give him a name?—No, I do not know his name; a person called previously to that to ask a question, whom I believe to be a clerk of Messrs. Vizard & Leman's, or else to have come through their direction.

16963. You mean the same Vizard & Leman who are concerned for Mr. Stephenson's line of railway?—I believe it to be the same.

16964. Be so good as to tell us when the first call was made; was it before their railway had been declared to be ineligible as a matter of railway speculation?—That occurrence took place in the last week, and it was certainly before that.

16965. That was the first call?—Yes.

16966. About how long ago was that?—I have no idea of the length of time; I should think it about a month, or more than that.

16967. How soon after the first call by the gentleman who purported to be a clerk of Mr. Vizard, under those circumstances, did you get another?—I have no recollection of it.

16968. I am afraid you did not get a pound for the call they made upon you; you did not get any money; when about was it?—I should say, about a fortnight afterwards.

16969. Can you tell who that person was?—No, I cannot; I have seen him about this place to-day.

16970. Is that the gentleman [*pointing to Mr. Stevens*]?—No, it was not.

16971. It was a gentleman who was here, but is not here now, you think?—He is not in the room.

16972. What did he say to you?—He wished to question me in regard to my having signed.

16973. Did he tell you who he was?—No, he did not.

16974. Did

16974. Did he not give himself even a name?—No.

16975. Did he tell you whom he came from?—I do not know that he did.

16976. He wished to question you?—Yes.

16977. Did he question you?—No.

16978. If he wished it, you did not answer?—I did not, most assuredly.

16979. That was because you thought the private transactions of your correspondents were not the subject of discussion with a nameless person?—Yes.

16980. Did anything else occur?—He came again himself.

16981. When?—A day or two ago.

16982. Was he more successful then?—No.

16983. Did he say anything to you then?—He wished to question me again.

16984. Did you decline it?—Yes.

16985. Is that all you have seen of him?—Yes, that was the last I have seen of him.

16986. Did you see anybody else after that?—I saw a person yesterday morning, who called for the first time.

16987. A clerk?—The party I believe to be a clerk; I cannot say.

16988. Why do you say you believe him to be so?—He said he came from Vizard & Leman.

16989. Did you have any communication with him?—The only communication was handing me a summons to attend here.

16990. Was that all that passed?—I believe that to be all that passed.

Re-examined by Mr. *Austin.*

16991. Then, we understand you are what we call a reluctant witness?—No.

16992. I do not mean in giving your evidence; you have given it extremely well: you did not volunteer your evidence?—Most certainly not.

16993. Do you know Mr. Fisher of Manchester personally?—Only by seeing him at the office of my employer.

16994. What do you know of Mr. Fairclough of Liverpool?—I have likewise seen him there.

16995. Is that all you know of him?—Yes.

16996. Were you informed, at the time that Messrs. Moxon directed you to present the white scrip, that it was on account of Mr. Fisher and Mr. Fairclough?—I was aware of it.

16997. Were you informed of it?—An order came up from them to pay.

16998. You saw the letter?—Yes, I heard it read.

16999. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Should you have any objection to produce the letter received?—I have not it here.

17000. Were the communications by letter in both instances enclosing the scrip?—Yes, they were.

17001. Mr. *Austin.*] You know the fact from the letter, or from Mr. Moxon?—Yes.

17002. Did Mr. Moxon give you any directions or not to represent that fact at the office?—He did give me directions to represent that.

17003. Did you tell it to the secretary that the scrip belonged to Mr. Fisher of Manchester?—To the best of my recollection, I did.

17004. Do you believe that you did?—Yes, I do believe it.

17005. Have you any doubt of it?—It is some time ago; I might not possibly have done it, but I think it very unlikely I should not have done it.

17006. Did you tell him, on the second occasion, that you presented it on behalf of Mr. Fairclough?—I do not think I stated that name, but I have no doubt I stated it came from a correspondent in the country.

17007. That was the 25th of January?—On or about that time.

17008. On the same day that Mr. Dean told you it was forfeited?—I do not think the payment was made on that day.

17009. Did you make the statement to him that day?—Yes.

17010. Had you made that communication to him on both occasions before you were permitted to sign the deed?—Yes.

17011. And he permitted you to sign the deed afterwards on both occasions?—Yes.

17012. You said just now, that you believed some communication took place with a director?—Yes.

Mr. *W. J. Mackie.*

11 May 1837.

17013. Do you know that fact of your own knowledge?—I was not present.

17014. From whom did you learn it?—From Mr. Thomas Moxon.

17015. Did Mr. Moxon tell you who the director was?—I do not recollect that he told me himself, but I believe it to have been Mr. Sutton.

17016. Robert Sutton, was it?—Yes.

07017. Robert Sutton, junior?—Yes, it was.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *James Van Sumner,* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *J. Van Sumner.*

17018. Mr. *Austin.*] ARE you a member of the Stock Exchange?—I am.

17019. Do you know Mr. Samuel Carr?—I do know him.

17020. Was Mr. Samuel Carr a member of the Stock Exchange at any time?—He has been a member for a few years past, till this year.

17021. Do you know how he happened to have ceased to be a member this year?—He has not made application.

17022. Is it necessary, for the purpose of continuing to be a member of the Exchange, to make an application?—Every member of the house must be an nually elected the 25th of March.

17023. Is there any ceremony to be gone through, of a pecuniary nature, upon that election?—No, not upon re-admission; it is not supposed he will bring his money in his pocket.

17024. Was Samuel Carr re-admitted last year?—You are speaking of the 25th of March last year?

17025. Yes.—He was re-admitted 25th of March 1836.

17026. Did he perform that ceremony?—What ceremony?

17027. The paying 10*l.*, or guineas?—No, he did not.

17028. *Chairman.*] That was the subscription for the current year of 1836?—For the last year.

17029. Mr. *Austin.*] The subscriptions are paid in advance?—Yes, in advance of the year; he pays ten guineas, and he walks in till March 1837.

17030. He did not pay it in March 1836?—No.

17031. Was application made to him?—Repeatedly.

17032. And repeated refusal?—He pleaded inconvenience, and could not pay, in point fact.

17033. How often was it inconvenient to him?—I should say altogether; I have applied to him a dozen times altogether.

17034. Did he not say he could not pay the money?—He did.

17035-36. And asked for time?—Yes, which I granted him; I took the responsibility upon myself, and gave him time from week to week, and at the early part of this year I pressed him again upon the subject, and it strikes me, he said he was going out of town, but when he returned he should be able to pay it; but when he returned he could not raise the money, and he said he must throw himself upon the managers of the concern. I said I wished he would, and relieve me from the inconvenience.

17037. Do you happen to know in what reputed circumstances Mr. Carr has been on the Exchange during that year?—I was was not quite sure I should be called upon; I do not know of my own knowledge, but I can tell you his reputed circumstances; it was supposed during the year he was not a man in solvent circumstances.

17038. Was that a circumstance current upon the Stock Exchange?—I do not think he was a man generally known in the house; he very seldom made his appearance, hardly at all the last year, and that was the reason I did not press him for it; he said he did no great business, and could do no great harm; he did not come in short.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

17039. How long have you been secretary to the Stock Exchange?—Between six and seven years, since the year 1831; I have been a member of the Stock Exchange for 29 years.

17040. During the time you have been secretary to the Stock Exchange, have you become acquainted with the manner of transacting business in shares?—No, I have not.

17041. Do you not know that they pass current from hand to hand?—I hear that a great deal of business is doing in the house in shares.

17042. In

Mr. *J. Van Sumner.*

11 May 1837.

17042. In your character of secretary, do you not know that there is a great deal of business transacted in shares of railway companies?—I can say nothing more than I said just now, that I know such things are negotiated on the Stock Exchange; I know it most assuredly.

17043. *Chairman.*] What things?—Shares of various sorts the gentleman asked me.

17044. Mr. *Alexander.*] Do you know that, on the production of those shares at the offices of the companies, the signature of the holder is required?—I know nothing of them; I had never anything to do with any of them, and cannot answer the question.

[The Witness withdrew.

Samuel Carr, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Samuel Carr.

17045. Mr. *Austin.*] DO you live at No. 27, Half-moon Crescent, Pentonville?—I do.

17046. In whose house?—The name of the landlord is Place; he lives in the New Kent-road.

17047. Is the house yours?—I have let it since Michaelmas last; but I resided there a year and a half; it was where my brother resided; and after his death I went to live there.

17048. Does your name appear in the subscription list of Rennie's Brighton Line?—I have every reason to believe it does; I could tell if I saw it.

17049. Did you sign the deed yourself?—Yes, I did.

17050. When was the first time upon which you signed the deed?—I think it was November last; I will not be positive of that fact.

17051. For how many shares did you sign upon that occasion?—I have reason to believe, from seeing it in the papers, it is five shares [*the deed was shown to the Witness*] I did sign.

17052. For five shares?—Yes.

17053. £. 375 being the value?—Yes.

17054. What day was it?—I believe the 14th or 15th of November.

17055. Upon that occasion where did you sign the deed?—I think it was at the banking-house of Hankeys, or Spooner's; I do not know which, being in the habit of dealing in shares; I think it was at Hankey's.

17056. Did you produce any certificate?—Yes, I believe I did.

17057. Of that description [*exhibiting a form of certificate*]?—Yes.

17058. Of that colour; white?—Yes.

17059. Do you believe it?—I have no doubt of it.

17060. Did you produce any money in addition to the certificates?—Yes, or I should not have had the new ones.

17061. Then you got the new ones?—Yes.

17062. Did you sign the deed then?—I did.

17063. And got the blue certificates?—Yes.

17064. What did you do with those certificates when you got them?—In all probability I sold them, along with some others; I cannot charge my memory with what I did with them; I have not got them now; and no doubt they have been sold.

17065. Do you recollect whether you sold them at a premium?—Not for some time previous; any of the shares that have been sold have been at a loss; most of the shares have been sold at a loss.

17066. I speak of these shares?—I cannot say; probably at a loss.

17067. Did you sign the deed again?—Yes.

17068. About what time?—From the statement in the papers, I find it is the 15th, for 110 shares.

17069. Was it the same day or the day after?—The day after.

17070. The first must have been the 14th?—Yes, it was.

17071. That is 8,250 *l.*?—I could soon calculate it.

17072. Did you perform the same operation then, of handing over the white certificates?—

17073. And the requisite sum of money?—Yes.

17074. Did you get the blue certificates in return?—Yes.

17075. Did you sign a third time?—Yes.

17076. When was that?—In the month of January.

17077. What

Samuel Carr.

11 May 1837.

17077. What day?—I do not know.

17078. Cannot you tell me something about the time?—I can call one circumstance to mind; it was that very foggy day.

17079. Was it the 17th of January?—I could soon tell by the calendar; it was that very foggy day in the city.

17080. Did you sign on that occasion for 819 shares?—Yes.

17081. £. 61,425?—Yes; I can call that to my recollection; it was a very bad pen, and I wrote it very black.

17082. Did you sign a fourth time?—Yes, I did.

17083. Upon the fourth occasion did you sign for 500 shares?—Yes.

17084. £.37,500?—Yes.

17085. That makes 107,550*l.*?—Yes, that is the gross amount.

17086. Did you also sign the City and Richmond list?—Yes, it was the City Railway; I believe I did; I have no doubt of it.

17087. The City and Richmond was signed for 150 shares?—I do not charge my memory to that circumstance.

17088. Do you hesitate about it?—I think it was for 40 and 50.

17089. Were you examined before this Committee?—No; I was summoned to this Committee, and was here eight days, and not called.

17090. Was not it 7,500*l.*?—If I saw the deed I could answer directly, but I cannot answer without; I went on two or three occasions to the office of the company, nearly opposite the Mansion-house, over a seed shop; but as to the amount, I cannot charge my memory; it was of such a daily occurrence, I cannot recollect.

17091. Did you sign the South Western?—Yes, I did.

17092. And the Kent and Dover?—I cannot charge my memory; I have signed five or six deeds.

17093. For large amounts?—Not all large amounts.

17094. Some of them?—The South Western was the largest.

17095. I am told you would not have anything to do with Stephenson's; did you sign Stephenson's deed?—No, I did not.

17096. *Chairman.*] What do you call a large amount?—I call this a very large amount.

17097. Mr. *Austin.*] £.107,000?—It is not so much as I have dealt in in my time.

17098. Upon the first occasion, when you signed Rennie's deed, did you describe yourself as of the Stock Exchange?—To the best of my belief, I did.

17099. On the second and third occasions?—I believe I did.

17100. And you signed yourself gentleman upon all occasions?—Yes.

17101. Upon the fourth occasion you signed as of No. 3, Upper Charles-street, Northampton-square?—Yes.

17102. Whom did you see upon the first occasion of your signing?—I should imagine some of the clerks at the banking-house.

17103. Where had you got that white scrip?—No doubt I had bought it.

17104. Did you ever live at No. 3, Upper Charles-street, Northampton-square?—Yes.

17105. When?—Previous to where I am living now.

17106. Did you pay rent for it?—Yes; but I had left orders for any letters that came to me to be forwarded, which has been done.

17107. Upon that occasion you were living in Half-moon Crescent?—Yes; but I was not the owner of the house.

17108. You were living in Half-moon Crescent, and not in Upper Charles-street?—What was the date? I have never signed any deed at 27, Half-moon Crescent; but having dealings in shares, I signed as from Upper Charles-street, and I have always signed from there. I had goods there at a later date than the 27th of January.

17109. You say you bought scrip on the first occasion?—I have every reason to believe that I bought it, or got it in the way of business.

17110. What do you mean by taking it in the way of business?—Selling 10 shares of one description, and buying five of another.

17111. To the best of your recollection, the scrip came to you in that form?—Yes.

17112. Did you sign the deed on your own account?—Yes.

17113. The day after, when you took 110 shares, or on the second occasion, where

where did you get the white scrip?—To the best of my belief, I received it in the same way of business.

17114. You do not remember from whom you had received it?—No; I have endeavoured to try, but cannot.

17115. Have you signed the original deed at all?—I do not think I have at all, but I am not sure.

17116. Was your name in those certificates, or were you only the holder?—I was only the holder; there was no name inserted.

17117. Did you buy the 110 certificates?—I have every reason to believe I did.

17118. Where did you buy them?—In the market.

17119. And you signed the deed on your own account?—I did, to the best of my belief.

17120. What do you mean by that; can there be any doubt about it?—Yes; if I had not signed it in the way of business, then there would be no doubt; but I consider I have signed the deed in the way of business.

17121. What do you mean by that?—I buy the shares at less price out of doors; there is always a difference in the price among persons not belonging to the Stock Exchange; and they sell at a higher price when the deed is signed, because they have a law on the Stock Exchange, that they shall only be sold when the deed is signed.

17122. Upon the third occasion, when you purchased 819 shares, did you purchase them on your own account?—No, I did not.

17123. Upon whose account did you purchase them?—A gentleman of the name of Huckvale.

17124. When you say you purchased them, you mean you paid the call and got the other scrip?—Yes.

17125. Who is Mr. Huckvale?—A respectable gentleman on the Stock Exchange.

17126. Is he a member of the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

17127. On the 17th of January he was a respectable gentleman on the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

17128. Had he made any application to you about them?—Yes.

17129. When?—That morning.

17130. Had he spoken to you before about it?—No.

17131. How long had you known him?—Several years.

17132. Had he known you several years?—Yes.

17133. At that time you were not in exceedingly good circumstances?—No.

17134. In indifferent circumstances?—Rather so.

17135. Did Mr. Huckvale know that fact?—I dare say he might know I was in middling circumstances.

17136. Have you any doubt of it?—I do not know that he knew I was in such bad circumstances as I was; he knew I was coming in and out of the Stock Exchange.

17137. That being the state of things, be so good as to tell me whether or not Mr. Huckvale applied to you on the 17th of January, or did you apply to Mr. Huckvale?—I rather think he applied to me.

17138. What was the nature of his application?—He wanted some shares signed for, and could I get any one to do it.

17139. Was that his application?—Something to that effect: "You are dealing out of doors, perhaps you have some by you, and you may as well put them in." It was near the last day of the signing; it was within a few days of the last day.

17140. What did you say?—I said I would undertake to do it at a commission.

17141. What else passed between you?—I said I was going to the Bank; he said, "Perhaps you will be back in an hour or two;" I went back to him, and he gave me the scrip.

17142. He gave you the scrip?—Yes.

17143. For 819 shares?—Yes.

17144. And what?—And the money.

17145. Or cheque?—Money; then I went to the office.

17146. Where?—First, I went to the banking-house.

17147. Hankey's?—Yes.

17148. You found the books were sent to the Poultry?—Yes.

17149. The company's office?—The deeds, I mean.

17150. Did

Samuel Carr.

11 May 1837.

17150. Did you go to the Poultry?—I did.

17151. Did you go alone?—I went alone in the first instance.

15152. Who did you find at the Poultry?—I saw Mr. Huckvale, who met me in the entrance, or between there and the bankers', because I was kept a long while at Hankey's.

17153. Did he meet you there by accident, or by appointment?—He wanted the shares; he had some to deliver, and I was to give them back to him as soon as I could; and when he overtook me, I was going to the office.

17154. Did you go together into the office?—Yes, I believe we did.

17155. Who did you see there?—Some of the gentlemen officiating in the office.

17156. Such as Mr. Dean?—I do not think I saw Mr. Dean in the outer office; he was in the inner office.

17157. Who did you see in the outer office?—I believe Mr. Dean was there.

17158. Did you see him there?—Yes, I believe I did.

17159. Was Mr. Huckvale with you at that time?—Yes.

17160. When you saw Mr. Dean, did any conversation take place?—I handed him the money and the shares, and I said I wanted new scrip.

17161. Did you arrange the terms of the commission before you went?—No.

17162. Did you sign the deed?—Yes, I did.

17163. Did you get the blue papers before or after?—Immediately after.

17164. Was Mr. Huckvale there while you signed the deed?—In one of the offices or the other, because he wanted the scrip; I do not know which.

17165. Was Mr. Dean there?—I cannot charge my memory; several gentlemen were there.

17166. Did you tell the secretary or the gentleman to whom you addressed yourself you wanted the scrip for yourself?—I said nothing about it; he concluded it was for myself.

17167. You signed in your own name?—I did.

17168. Mr. Huckvale knowing you were signing in your own name?—He did.

17169. To whom was the blue scrip delivered?—I gave it to Mr. Huckvale.

17170. To whom was it delivered?—To me.

17171. Where did you deliver it to Mr. Huckvale?—Part in the office, and part going out; he counted part, and I counted part, to see that it was correct

17172. Where did you count it?—At Chapel-place.

17173. Did you give any of it to Mr. Huckvale in the office?—Yes.

17174. Was it in the presence of any of the officiating persons?—Yes.

17175. Was it in the presence of Mr. Dean?—I do not know, for I do not recollect where Mr. Dean was.

17176. Where had you received the money you went to pay?—As near two o'clock as possible.

17177. Where?—In the Rotunda at the Bank, or coming down the steps.

17178. When you got out of the office you gave the rest of the certificates to Mr. Huckvale?—I did.

17179. What did you receive for having effected this transfer?—Nothing at that time.

17180. What were you ever paid for it?—For that alone, or what I signed for afterwards?

17181. For that alone.—I cannot divide the things; I received 5*l.* the following day after the 500 were signed for.

17182. The following day did you effect another transaction?—Yes

17183. For how much?—Five hundred.

17184. Who was that for?—For Mr. Huckvale.

17185. Was that for a commission?—Yes; a portion of the other.

17186. Who gave you the certificates?—Mr. Huckvale.

17187. Did he go with you?—Yes, he went with me on that occasion.

17188. Whom did you see?—Some of the clerks in the office.

17189. Did you see Mr. Dean?—I cannot charge my memory; at that time I did not know Mr. Dean; I have had occasion to know him since.

17190. By name?—Yes.

17191. At that time did you see a person you have since known as Mr. Dean?—I cannot charge my memory.

17192. Who produced the certificates?—I did.

17193. And the money?—Yes.

17194. Was it paid in the shape of money, or a cheque?—Cash.

17195. In what room was this where you got these certificates?—In the right-hand room as you enter through the lobby.

17196. Was there any inscription on the room?—My memory is not sufficiently good to enable me to say.

17197. Did you see any one in that room?—A gentleman sitting at a desk.

17198. Who was it?—He was surrounded by a number of other scrip; he was very busy; he had a good deal of scrip about him similar to what I had bought.

17199. Did that gentleman sign the scrip?—I do not know.

17200. *Chairman.*] Did you see him do it?—I did not.

17201. Mr. *Austin.*] Had you seen anybody sign the blue scrip the day before?—A clerk in the office signed it.

17202. Whereabouts did he sign it; do you mean there [*showing the scrip to the Witness*]?—I cannot say; I was there when he did sign, and I counted them afterwards.

17203. Were they ready signed by the directors, or not?—I do not think I should have brought them away if they had not been.

17204. Was Mr. Huckvale with you during the whole time?—Yes, he was waiting there.

17205. Was he with you?—No, because he went into the office where they were signing the deed; there was some gentleman he was speaking to.

17206. Who were in the room?—Several gentlemen who appeared to have come on similar business, waiting by the fire.

17207. Were there any other persons in the room?—Only the clerks in the room I had seen the day before.

17208. What did you do with those certificates?—I gave them to Mr. Huckvale.

17209. Where did you give them to him?—In the office.

17210. In the room?—I believe it was in the room.

17211. What room?—To the right; because I had to go into the other room opposite, and then to come back again to receive the new scrip.

17212. That was in the room where the gentleman was sitting at the table?—Yes.

17213. Whether that gentleman was the secretary or a director you do not know?—No.

17214. Do you recollect whether that gentleman was Mr. Dean or not?—No, I cannot.

17215. Did you produce the certificates upon that occasion?—I did.

17216. Where had they been given to you?—Either at the entrance of the Stock Exchange or the Bank; I went over to him, but he was not ready, and it was as we came down the street arm-in-arm.

17217. Did Mr. Huckvale know you signed in your own name?—Yes, he did.

17218. When were you paid the commission?—When I had signed for the 500 shares.

17219. Where were you paid the commission?—At the Stock Exchange.

17220. By whom?—Mr. Huckvale.

17221. For how much?—He asked me what would satisfy me; I said, "I should not think of charging you more than 5*l.*" "Well," said he, "are you sure that will satisfy you;" and I said, "Yes."

17222. *Chairman.*] That is 1,319 shares?—Yes.

17223. Mr. *Austin.*] Did Mr. Huckvale apply to you on any subsequent occasion?—He did.

17224. When?—It was on the same day that I signed for the 500.

17225. After you had signed?—That was a portion of the others.

17226. What was?—The 510 shares that that man named Poulton has laid an information against.

17227. Was the application made to you after you had signed or before, on the second day, by Mr. Huckvale?—Before I had signed the last 500.

17228. What was the application he made to you?—He said there was a remnant of shares he should like to get done, as it was approaching to the last day; it was the last day, and I agreed to do it for him.

17229. What arrangement did you make with him as to the 510?—No arrangement at all; but that I should get them done for him.

17230. Did you tell him how you should get them done for him?—No; he knew

Samuel Carr.

11 May 1837.

knew I had dealings in shares, and he knew I had more facilities than he had.

17231. How did you effect that business?—By getting the man Poulton to sign for me.

17232. How did you get him?—He applied to me some time before, and said, "Carr, I am very poor, if you can put a pound in my way, do."

17233. Did he mention in what way you could put a pound in his way?—Yes, in signing for shares.

17234. Did you know he had been discharged under the Insolvent Debtors Act?—I did not know that then.

17235. Do you know it now?—I have heard it since; I believe once or twice he has. I have made inquiry about him since.

17236. Did you apply to him on that occasion?—Yes, I did.

17237. You knew he was very poor?—Yes.

17238. What was your application to him?—I told him, if he would do that I would give him a sovereign.

17239. If he would do the 510?—It was not so many then, it was between 300 and 400, and I put some more to them.

17240. Had you then 300 or 400 shares in your possession at that time?—No.

17241. Who had?—Mr. Huckvale.

17242. Had he told you the number?—He wished me to sign for a remnant; I did not know what they were.

17243. How did you know how many Mr. Huckvale had?—I believe he said 300 or 400.

17244. You agreed with Poulton he should sign?—Yes.

17245. When was it to be done?—He was to take the money and the scrip.

17246. When?—On that day.

17247. Was it done on that day?—He went to the office.

17248. Was the whole affair finished that day?—Yes.

17249. Was that the 18th?—Yes, I believe it was.

17250. Did you go to the office yourself with Mr. Poulton?—Yes, I did.

17251. Did anybody else go with him?—Yes, Mr. Huckvale.

17252. Did you inform Mr. Huckvale you had got Mr. Poulton to do the business?—I do not think I did at that time.

17253. Did he know that Poulton was going for that purpose?—I do not know that he knew it; he might have judged it.

17254. Have you any doubt he knew what Poulton was going for?—I had not told him.

17255. Have you any doubt he knew what you were going for?—I have no doubt he knew I was going for that purpose.

17256. Did you go into the same room as before?—Yes.

17257. Who were there?—The same gentlemen, sitting at a table.

17258. Why did you not sign yourself for this batch of shares?—I thought I had signed for sufficient.

17259. Did you tell Poulton so?—Yes.

17260. Did you not tell Mr. Huckvale so?—No.

17261. Will you state that?—No, I will not; but I do not believe I did.

17262. *Chairman.*] You are bound to speak the truth?—I have hitherto.

27263. Mr. *Austin.*] Did you tell Mr. Huckvale you should get Poulton to do it?—I do not believe I did.

17264. Did you tell him you should get anybody to do it?—Yes, I believe I did.

17265. Did you tell him you should not do it yourself?—Yes, I did.

17266. Did you tell him you should get somebody else to do it?—Yes.

17267. Did you not tell Mr. Huckvale, when you intimated that to him, that you had signed for quite enough yourself?—Yes, I did.

17268. That was before Mr. Huckvale went with you and Poulton to the office?—Yes.

17269. Now, then, have you any doubt that Mr. Huckvale knew what Poulton was going to the office for?—I have said before I have no doubt he concluded what it was for.

17270. Who was in the room?—Some gentlemen; I cannot call to mind the features.

17271. Was

17271. Was it the secretary?—I did not know the secretary at that time.

17272. Have you known him since?—Yes.

17273. Was it the person you have since known to be the secretary?—I should say, I think it is.

17274. Have you a doubt upon the subject?—I cannot say it was him, or that it was not; I was anxious to get the scrip, and to get away.

17275. Who presented the certificates?—I did.

17276. Where did you get them?—Mr. Huckvale gave them to me.

17277. At what place?—I cannot charge my memory.

17278. Was it in the place, or away from it?—Whether it was in the office or going along, I do not know.

17279. You presented the certificate to this gentleman sitting in the chair?—Yes, to the best of my belief, I did.

17280. Who paid the money?—There was no money paid at all at that time.

17281. What passed?—The old scrip was left there as a security.

17282. Was any statement made about paying the money?—It was the last day; and they were so very busy, they were left there to be called for another day.

17283. Did the gentleman in the chair tell you that?—Yes, I believe he did.

17284. Was he the gentleman with whom you made that arrangement?—Yes.

17285. Who signed the deed?—Mr. Poulton did, on that occasion; I beg pardon for calling him Mr., I should say Poulton.

17286. Who was present when Poulton signed the deed?—Mr. Huckvale.

17287. And you?—Yes.

17288. Who else?—Several gentlemen in the office.

17289. Any of the official persons?—Yes; they all appeared to be acting.

17290. *Chairman.*] Were you told the white certificates were to be held there as a security?—Yes, I understood that.

17291. From whom?—The person sitting at the desk; but I think it was a suggestion of Mr. Huckvale's, being late, for the money to be paid the next day.

17292. Do you mean that Mr. Huckvale made that suggestion to the gentleman in the chair?—Yes.

17293. It was not you?—No; I had not got the money.

17294. It was not you or Poulton?—No.

17295. Whatever it was, did it take place between Mr. Huckvale and the gentleman?—Yes, and I stood by.

17296. How came Poulton to be permitted to sign the deed?—Upon leaving the scrip as a security, and the money to be paid the following day.

17297. Did he get any permission?—I believe he did.

17298. Was it given to you, or to Poulton?—It was given first to Poulton, then to me, and I gave it to Mr. Huckvale.

17299. Who gave that permission?—The gentleman in the chair.

17300. Was it a bit of written paper?—Yes.

17301. What became of it?—I did not receive it.

17302. Did you see what became of it?—Mr. Huckvale, I believe, had it.

17303. Then you went into the next room?—Yes.

17304. What did Mr. Huckvale do with the written paper?—I do not know.

17305. When you signed the deed had you given a written order?—No.

17306. You said the person who had the custody of the deed allowed you to sign it?—I took the old scrip and paid the money.

17307. Upon this occasion a piece of paper was taken?—Yes.

17308. And the old scrip?—No, that was left in the other room.

17309. I want to know how Poulton came to be permitted to sign the deed?—I cannot tell.

17310. By what authority?—It was with the sanction of the gentleman in the room.

17311. How was that sanction expressed?—I cannot say

17312. Was it in writing?—I saw him write; but I did not know the contents of it.

17313. You saw a written paper handed to Mr. Huckvale?—Yes.

17314. And did you see him do anything with it in the deed-room?—No.

17315. Mr. Poulton was permitted to sign the deed?—Yes.

17316. Did Mr. Huckvale know of it?—Yes.

 17317. To

Samuel Carr.

11 May 1837.

17317. To whom were the blue certificates given?—They were not given at all; the old scrip was left.

17318. You went away?—Yes.

17319. Were you there with Poulton and Mr. Huckvale the whole time?—Yes.

17320. From the beginning to the end of this transaction?—Yes.

17321. And you are sure no money was paid?—I saw none.

17322. Did you go away together?—Mr. Huckvale went away first; we went to the end of the court, and I went with Poulton.

17323. You left the office together?—Yes, I believe we did.

17324. Do you know whether the blue certificates were obtained for the shares?—I do not.

17325. You did not go again?—No.

17326. Did you see Poulton again about it?—Yes, I did.

17327. When?—The same afternoon.

17328. Did you give him any directions?—I gave him a sovereign; that was all I gave him.

17329. That was his pay?—Yes.

17330. Where did you get that sovereign?—A portion of the 5*l.* I got from Mr. Huckvale.

17331. The 5*l.* covered the whole transactions; four for you, and one for him?—Yes.

17332. Did you give him any directions to get the blue certificates?—No.

17333. You considered the business was done?—Yes, I considered so.

17334. What have you done with your own blue certificates of the first two investments?—They must have been gone long ago.

17335. You parted with them a long while ago?—Yes.

17336. You had nothing further to do with these affairs?—No.

17337. Except as you may be liable for that deed?—Yes, if it is law, which I have a very great query about.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

17338. How long has Mr. Huckvale been a member of the Stock Exchange, to your knowledge?—I have known him personally four or five years; but I have not known him intimately.

17339. Have you known him as a member of the Stock Exchange for that time?—Yes.

17340. Is he a gentleman who transacts a good deal of business at the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

17341. A gentleman of wealth and respectability?—Yes.

17342. Upon this last occasion, do I understand you that Mr. Huckvale and Mr. Poulton were engaged jointly in this transaction?—No; Mr. Huckvale employed me, and I employed Poulton.

17343. Were you all three there for the common purpose of effecting the transaction?—Yes.

17344. That was to get 510 old scrip exchanged for 510 new?—Yes.

17345. For which you did not see any money paid, but the scrip was left as a security?—Yes.

17346. Was this upon the very last day limited for signing the deed?—Yes, it was.

17347. Were there many other shareholders coming in and going out upon the same errand?—Yes.

17348. And a good deal of bustle and business in the office?—Yes.

17349. How long had you known Poulton before that?—I knew him about, since the companies coming out, a year and a half or two years; by sight I have known him years.

17350. You have been acquainted with him two years?—Yes.

17351. You stated you handed the 510 old certificates to Poulton, and he presented them to the clerk?—Yes.

17352. He was the person who, upon your presentation, signed the contract?—Yes.

17353. Were any part of these transactions between you and Mr. Huckvale and Poulton, as far as you know, known to the directors or any of the officers of this company?—None whatever.

17354. Was

17354. Was there the slightest information given, to your knowledge, to any one person connected with them, of the transactions taking place between you?—None whatever.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Robert Huckvale*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

17355. Mr. *Austin.*] ARE you a member of the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

17356. Were you a member of the Stock Exchange at the time that Mr. Carr and Mr. Poulton signed the deed of Rennie's Brighton Company for you?—Yes.

17357. How long have you known Carr?—I could not say; some years.

17358. Are you a subscriber to Rennie's Brighton Line yourself?—No.

17359. And never have been?—No, never have been.

17360. Did you, in January last, at any time request Carr to get certain renewed certificates in Rennie's Brighton Line for you?—I entered into an engagement with him to get me new shares for old.

17361. Were the old shares in your possession?—Yes.

17362. As holder?—Yes, I held them at that time.

17363. Not as an original subscriber?—No, as the holder of them.

17364. Had you purchased them yourself?—Yes, I purchased a good many myself; but of course you know there were two or three of us acting together in it; yes, I purchased them.

17365. I understand there was a joint property in those white certificates?—Yes.

17366. With two or three more?—Yes.

17367. Members of the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

17368. Was it two or three more?—Two more.

17369. Were those two gentlemen subscribers to the line?—I believe neither of them.

17370. I mean, of course, in their own name?—I so understand it.

17371. What are the names of those gentlemen?—Mr. Frith and Mr. Whitten.

17372. How long had you had the old certificates in your possession at the time you requested Carr to effect this business for you?—I cannot say.

17373. About how long?—I had had more or less ever since they came into the market.

17374. How long had they been in your joint possession?—I cannot say exactly that they were in our joint possession; but in making this agreement, I made at the same time an agreement for all the shares; call it a joint possession or what you like, there was no partnership.

17375. You were not partners in these shares?—No.

17376. You acted for yourself and those other two gentlemen to get those shares exchanged?—Yes, I undertook, in making this engagement, to manage their shares for them.

17377. You had agreed with Mr. Carr, as between you and Mr. Carr?—Yes.

17378. You agreed with Mr. Frith and Mr. Whitten separately?—Yes, it never occurred to me in any other way.

17379. What were the directions you gave to Carr?—I told him I wanted new shares for old.

17380. Did you give him your certificates?—Yes.

17381. And the proper deposit-money?—Yes; he wanted it; he could not advance it; he wished to borrow money to go and make the deposit.

17382. How do you mean?—I lent him the money to do it.

17383. I understand you to say that Carr borrowed the deposit money from you to effect the transfer?—Yes.

17384. How much did he borrow of you?—I do not recollect.

17385. Was it a sufficient sum to cover the requisite deposit upon all the certificates you gave him?—Not upon all.

17386. What was the deficiency?—I think 300, or 400, or 500 shares.

17387. What was the deficiency?—The deposit upon 300 or 400 shares.

17388. How many certificates did you give him?—I cannot recollect, I should have some difficulty in ascertaining.

17389. Have you any minute?—I do not know that I could make it out from my books.

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

11 May 1837.

17390. Am I to understand that you do not know, and could not make out, how many of the certificates were signed for, for you?—I do not think I could; I will not say I could not.

17391. Did you know, at the time you gave the certificates to Carr, what the requisite amount of deposit-money would be?— Per share?

17392. Yes.—Yes, I knew that.

17393 You knew the number of shares you gave him?—Yes.

17394. Did you give him all the deposit-money you knew at the time to be necessary to make the transfer?—No.

17395. You recollect that distinctly?—Yes.

17396. You lent him only a part?—Yes, I lent him part.

17397. What was the deficiency?—About 400 shares, or thereabout.

17398. That cannot be an answer to my question; you gave him a certain number of certificates?—Yes.

17399. Do I understand you to say that you lent him a sufficient sum to cover all the certificates except 400?—Yes.

17400. And you did not lend him a sum to cover those 400?—No.

17401. Would not the amount of deposit upon those be 400*l.*?—Yes.

17402. Do I understand you to say you gave him sufficient to cover all the deposit except 400*l.*?—Yes.

17403. Did you at no time lend him that 400*l.*?—No.

17404. At no time?—No.

17405. Do you remember the day the first transfer was effected?—No.

17406. Do you remember the number of shares that were transferred?—No.

17407. Do you remember seeing Carr upon that day?—Yes, I saw him that day.

17408. Was it a foggy day?—Yes, very foggy.

17409. Did you go with him to the office?—Yes.

17410. Did you see the exchange of the shares effected?—Yes, I did.

17411. Who was in the room at the time?—I think it was at two different times.

17412. I am speaking of the foggy day; who was in the room?—The money was paid at the bankers'.

17413. Recollect yourself, it is the foggy day; on the foggy day, did you go to the office in the Poultry or to the bankers'?—First we went to the bankers'.

17414. Did you accompany Carr to the bankers'?—Yes, I did.

17415. From the bankers' did you go to the office?—Yes.

17416. Where was the money paid?—At the bankers'.

17417. Are you sure of it?—Yes.

17018. How much?—I cannot tell you.

17419. Have you any recollection?—No.

17420. Did you pay it in cash or cheque?—In notes.

17421. Where had you obtained the notes that morning; probably at your own banker's?—No, I do not recollect.

17422. Who paid the money at the bankers', you or Carr?—Carr.

17423. Had you given him the money before?—Yes.

17424. Where?—I do not recollect whether I gave it him before we started or afterwards.

17425. Where were the certificates at the moment the money was paid to the bankers?—In Carr's possession.

17426. Where did you give them to him?—Previously to starting.

17427. Where?—I cannot say; I do not recollect.

17428. Had you made no minute touching those certificates before you gave them to Carr?—No, none at all.

17429. Had you made no calculation of the sum of money that would be requisite to pay the deposits?—Yes, I knew at the time how many shares I was going to get exchanged.

17430. You had made that calculation?—Yes.

17431. Had you got the proper sum of money for that purpose?—Yes.

17432. Did that cover all the certificates you gave to Carr that day?—Yes.

17433. Then upon the foggy day you gave Carr a certain number of certificates, and the proper amount of money to pay for them?—Yes.

17434. You mean lent him?—Yes.

17435. Mr.

17435. Mr. Carr paid the money into the bankers'?—Yes.

17436. And you went with Carr to the Poultry?—Yes, after going to the bankers'.

17437. You say you lent this money to Carr; what security did you take for it?—I took no security at that time, except my own attendance upon him; I went with him.

17438. What security for the repayment of the money; did he give you his note or his bond?—No; I got the new shares, and them alone.

17439. Then do I understand you to say that you got the new shares from Carr, and received them as a security for the deposit-money?—No, I did not receive the shares as a security; I went with him.

17440. You have told me you took no security for the loan of the deposit-money up to the time you went to the Poultry; have you, at any time since you lent him the money, taken any security for it?—Never.

17441. Did you see Mr. Carr get the blue scrip?—Yes.

17442. Did he deliver the white scrip for it?—Yes.

17443. Did he sign the deed?—Yes.

17444. In your presence?—Yes.

17445. What did he do with the blue certificates?—He gave them to me.

17446. To take care of for him?—Yes.

17447. Do you mean that as an answer; do not let me entrap you, I do not intend it; do you mean that as an answer?—He gave me the certificates.

17448. To take care of for him?—No, I did not understand the question.

17449. You took the blue certificates?—Yes.

17450. Whose certificates were those blue certificates?—Why, I considered they were mine, as I had received no security from Carr, as soon as he had obtained them, for I obtained no further security.

17451. Do I understand you to tell the Committee you took the blue certificates as a security for the deposit; is that what you mean to say?—No.

17452. What do you mean to say?—You asked me if I took any security at all; I say that I took no security.

17453. Whose were those blue certificates after they were in your possession, when they were obtained by Carr?—Mine; I considered them mine.

17454. Have you ever considered them to belong to anybody else?—No, I did not, not these.

17455. Were not they bought for you; were not they obtained for you?—They might have been.

17456. Were not the white certificates yours?—They were.

17457. Did you not employ Carr to get them exchanged for blue?—I entered into an engagement with him.

17458. To get the blue certificates for them?—Yes.

17459. Have you got them now?—No.

17460. Have you sold them?—Yes; I may have some of them.

17461. Have you received any money for those you have sold?—Yes.

17462. Is that money yours or Carr's?—Mine.

17463. Do you now mean to tell the Committee you lent Carr the deposit-money?—Yes.

17464. Did you lend it him, or give it to him as your own money, in order to get your own white certificates exchanged for blue, which you have since sold and treated as your own?—I conceived he would not get them unless I did lend him the money.

17465. Did you lend it him, or give it to him as your own money, in order to get your white certificates exchanged for blue, which you have since sold and treated as your own?—I conceived at the time I lent it to him.

17466. You did?—Yes.

17467. For what purpose did you lend it to him?—To enable him to pay the deposits on the old shares.

17468. Do you mean then to say, that Carr had any interest in those white shares?—No, he had no interest.

17469. At no time?—Not that I am aware of.

17470. Was not the property in those white shares, until they were exchanged for blue shares, yours?—I believe they were.

17471. Have you any doubt that that property belonged to you?—I think I may safely say that they did.

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

11 May 1837.

17472. Have you any doubt that the blue shares were your property?—When Mr. Carr delivered them to me, no doubt at all.

17473. Have you any doubt that the sum of money you gave to Carr, for the purpose of obtaining the blue shares, was yours at the time you gave it to Carr?—I cannot say it was mine; it might be mine, or one of the other parties'.

17474. It was either yours or one of your two friends?—Yes.

17475. It was not Carr's?—No.

17476. Do you mean, in any common or ordinary sense in the English language of the word "lend," you lent that money to Carr?—Yes.

17477. What did you lend it to him for?—To enable him to procure the new shares.

17478. Did you lend it to him for your purposes or his?—It answered both our purposes, I suppose.

17479. Now, in point of fact, is not this the transaction; did you not employ Carr for the purpose of getting new shares for your old shares, and to sign the deed for you, in order that you might not have the obligation cast upon you that would otherwise be cast upon you by signing the deed yourself?—I got the exchange made on that account, of course.

17480. That was the substance of the transaction, was not it?—Yes.

17481. You knew Carr to be insolvent at that time?—No, I did not know anything about him.

17482. You knew he was not a man of substance?—I did not know; I did not think he was; I never thought about it.

17483. You suspected he was insolvent?—No.

17484. Did it never occur to you, up to that time, that Carr was not a solvent person?—It occurred to me he was not a man of property.

17485. Did it not occur to you he was a very fit man to apply to for the purpose?—I did not mind who I applied to.

17486. Would you have applied to a solvent man on the Stock Exchange for that purpose?—I should not have taken that into consideration.

17487. Should you have applied to an ordinary broker to have signed the deed; should you have signed the deed for any other broker, if they had applied to you?—Yes, if they had given me a sufficient premium.

17488. Should you have done it for 5*l.*?—No, I should not.

17489. *Chairman.*] Did you ever apply to a person you considered in good pecuniary circumstances to sign a deed for you in the same way as Carr signed for you in this instance?—Never.

17490. Mr. *Austin.*] That was the first day; there was a transaction of a similar description the next day?—I do not know whether it was the next day, there was another transaction.

17491. Can you now recollect how many shares you got exchanged on the first day?—No; I could ascertain it, I believe.

17492. Could you ascertain it?—Yes, when I have examined my books, I think it very probable I could.

17493. Do you think 819 shares was near the mark the first day?—It is a good many; but I really could not say.

17494. Do you not recollect paying 819 *l.* to the bankers; it is a large sum?—No, I do not recollect it; I cannot say whether it was 500 *l.*, 600 *l.* or 700 *l.*

17495. You recollect the next day that you required him to transact a similar affair for 500 shares?—I do not know that it was the next day, or that it was 500 shares.

17496. Did you afterwards apply to him upon the subject of a considerable number of shares?—Yes.

17497. Was it on your own account, or on the account of your two friends?—Whether it was my own account or not, I cannot recollect; it might be for my friends as well.

17498. You got him to sign for the same purpose?—I entered into another engagement with him to procure me shares.

17499. Can you recollect for what friends?—If for any person, it would be Whitten and Frith.

17500. The same parties?—Yes.

17501. Did you go with him the second day?—Yes.

17502. I do not quite understand, at this moment, whether you mean to tell the Committee you paid the whole of the deposit-money upon the whole of the shares

shares exchanged the first day, or paid the whole, minus 400 *l.*?—I paid the whole of it.

17503. On the second day did you give certificates to Carr?—Yes.

17504. Do you remember the number?—No, I do not.

17505. Did you give him the deposit-money?—Yes.

17506. To the requisite amount?—Yes.

17507. To cover all the shares then given to him?—I know one time I did not give him all the money; but I cannot recollect whether it was that time or not.

17508. Did you go with him to the office?—Yes.

17509. You saw him sign the deed as before, and obtain the shares?—Yes.

17510. He gave the blue shares to you in the same manner?—Yes.

17511. Who was at the office at the time you went on the second occasion?—There were two offices.

17512. In the first office who was present?—I do not know any individual.

17513. Do you know Mr. Dean, the secretary?—I have known him since.

17514. Did you at that time see a person you have since known as Mr. Dean, the secretary?—Yes, I saw him that day.

17515. In the first room?—No.

17516. Was anybody in the first room on the second day you have since known?—No, I do not think there was.

17517. What was done in the room?—I might have seen Mr. Sutton there; but I cannot distinctly recollect whether I did or did not.

17518. Did you know Mr. Sutton?—Yes.

17519. At that time?—Yes.

17520. And had known him some time before?—Yes.

17521. A member of the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

17522. Robert Sutton, jun.?—Yes.

17523. I believe he was a director of Rennie's London and Brighton Railway?—Yes.

17524. Did you see him at this office on some occasion?—I have no distinct recollection whether I saw him at that particular time.

17525. Did you see him at the office at any time?—Yes, I did.

17526. When did you see him at the office?—One day.

17527. About what time?—It might have been two or three o'clock in the afternoon.

17528. Upon the day you got the second shares?—I do not know the day I have seen him; he has called when shares were got, at one time or the other, but I do not know which.

17529. You saw him there when shares were got for you?—Yes.

17530. Was it upon the occasion when Mr. Carr went the first or the second time, or either of those times?—I have some indistinct recollection of having seen Mr. Sutton there, but what time it was I cannot tell.

17531. Was it upon one of the occasions when you were there with Mr. Carr?—Yes, I think he came into the office when we were there.

17532. Did you talk to him?—Yes, he asked me the price of shares, something of that kind; I had no further conversation with him.

17533. Had you any shares in your possession at that time, white or blue?—I do not recollect.

17534. You do not remember whether you told Mr. Sutton what you had come about?—I do not think I did.

17535. Are you quite certain about that?—I do not think I did.

17536. You will not undertake to say you did not tell him?—No; I took so little notice of the affair at the time.

17537. Whatever the reason is, you will not undertake to say you did not tell him what you were there for?—I do not recollect saying so.

17538. And you will not undertake to say you did not tell him?—I would not say that positively; but I do not think I did.

17539. Had you any conversation with Mr. Sutton at any other time or place about the shares?—No further than giving him the price of the day. I have no recollection of ever having any further conversation with him.

17540. Now refer to the second occasion when you went with Mr. Carr; you received the shares in the like manner as at the time before?—Yes.

17541. And you knew he signed the deed upon that occasion?—Yes, I think he did.

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

11 May 1837.

17542. Did you not procure him to sign the deed upon that occasion for the same purposes as you had procured him the time before?—Yes, it was on similar terms.

17543. And for the same purpose, and with the same object?—Yes.

17544. To avoid signing the deed yourself, there is no mincing the matter?—I would have burnt the shares rather than have signed the deed myself; it was a question with me if I could get any other person to sign the deed; I had no other interest in it beyond being a dealer in shares.

17545. You afterwards went with one Mr. Poulton and Mr. Carr?—Yes, I think there was a man of that name.

17546. Did you go with Mr. Poulton yourself; how was that?—I think Poulton went with Mr. Carr and myself.

17547. Had you at that time had any conversation with Mr. Carr with respect to this Poulton?—No, I do not think I had.

17548. Had not Mr. Carr told you he had signed for enough, and would not or ought not to sign for any more?—He told me he had signed for a great many.

17549. Did he not say he had signed for enough?—I do not know that he used that word.

17550. Was not that the idea?—Yes.

17551. Was not the idea this: that Mr. Carr had signed for as many as it was expedient he should sign for, and that Mr. Poulton should therefore be got to sign for the rest?—He gave me to understand so.

17552. And that Poulton should sign for the rest?—I did not care who it was.

17553. As you were going along, did not a suspicion cross your mind that Poulton was going to sign for some of your shares?—Yes, I thought it was so.

17554. Have you any doubt about it?—It appeared to me that Carr was going to employ Poulton to sign the deed for him.

17555. And for you?—I was to have the shares.

17556. You did not make a bargain with Poulton?—No.

17557. You left that with Mr. Carr?—Yes.

17558. Was the deed signed by Poulton accordingly?—Yes.

17559. Did you see it?—I think I may say I did.

17560. Perhaps I may say you have no doubt upon it?—I did.

17561. Be so kind as to recollect upon this occasion into what room you went first?—I think we went into the same room as at first; in the clerk's room.

17562. Was Mr. Dean, the secretary, there?—No, I think not; I do not recollect seeing him there.

17563. Do you recollect the conversation that passed upon that occasion between the official person and yourself?—No.

17564. Try and recollect what then occurred?—I have no recollection.

17565. Do you recollect the arrangement made upon that occasion about the certificates?—Yes, I do.

17566. State to the Committee what the arrangement was?—This was not in the first room; you are speaking of the first room?

17567. Yes.—We went into another room.

17568. We will begin again with the first room; tell the Committee what arrangement was made in the first room between you and the person there about the white scrip?—I do not recollect any arrangement.

17569. What took place?—Merely signing the deed; the shares were counted; I do not recollect anything else.

17570. Were the deposits paid?—I think the money was counted there, but it was not left.

17571. Who counted the money?—I do not know; it might be the clerk there.

17572. Who produced the money?—I think Mr. Carr.

17573. Are sure of that?—No.

17574. Had you given Carr any money upon that occasion?—Yes, I think I had on that occasion, from what I recollect.

17575. I do not wish to confuse you; quite the contrary: did you, upon that last occasion, advance Carr or Poulton, or both of them, the deposit-money to obtain the exchange?—I had nothing to do with Poulton.

17576. To Mr. Carr did you advance the money?—Yes.

17577. Before

17577. Before you went?—Yes; whether before I went or in the office I cannot tell.

17578. What did you mean just now by stating you gave Mr. Carr all the money except 400*l.*; just now you made the reservation?—You did not say all the sum; you asked if I had paid any money.

17579. Did you pay him any money?—Yes.

17580. Was that in the room?—I cannot say.

17581. Was it in the room or out?—I cannot say.

17582. How much money was it?—I cannot tell.

17583. Was it enough?—Not to cover all the shares.

17584. Was it in consequence of finding you had not money enough to cover all the shares that any arrangement took place as to the certificates?—Yes.

17585. With whom did that arrangement take place?—With Mr. Dean.

17586. And you?—Yes; and the secretary.

17587. And you?—Yes; I might have had something to do with it.

17588. Give me an answer?—It is so long ago I cannot really recollect.

17589. *Chairman.*] How do you know it was Mr. Dean, if you did not make the arrangement yourself?—I do not recollect making any arrangement.

17590. Have you not just said that an arrangement took place with Mr. Dean upon the subject?—Yes.

17591. How do you know that, if you did not make the arrangement yourself?—I was in the room.

17592. Mr. *Austin.*] Be so kind as to describe what the terms of the arrangement were?—That a certain number of shares should be kept for a future period.

17593. Did Mr. Dean assent to that?—He gave his consent to it as a matter of accommodation.

17594. Did you enter into this arrangement yourself?—I rather think I did.

17595. You had a conversation with Mr. Dean about it, had not you?—Yes, I think I asked him whether he would allow it.

17596. Have you any doubt you asked him that?—I have no doubt I asked him something similar.

17597. And you have no doubt Mr. Dean assented to your request?—No.

17598. Did you tell Mr. Dean on that occasion that Poulton was come to sign for you?—No.

17599. Did Mr. Dean know it?—I have not allowed that he had come to sign for me.

17600. Did you tell him you were coming with your scrip to get the scrip transferred?—I do not recollect saying anything of the sort.

17601. How did you represent the transaction to him?—I represented to him that the scrip was mine.

17602. You told Mr. Dean the scrip was yours, and that you were come for the blue scrip; is that so?—When I went for it, do you mean?

17603. Upon this occasion, the time of signing.—I did not tell him the scrip was mine then.

17604. How came you to make that arrangement?—For the delivery of the shares that were not paid upon, do you mean?

17605. Yes.—He gave an order.

17606. Who did?—Mr. Dean did.

17607. If you did not tell him the shares were yours, how came you to make that arrangement?—I scarcely understand that.

17608. You made an arrangement that the certificates should be left and the money not paid?—Yes.

17609. How came you to make that agreement, if you did not tell Mr. Dean you had an interest in the certificates?—I do not say I did not.

17610. Did you not tell him you had an interest in the certificates?—I cannot say I did.

17611. Will you say you did not?—No.

17612. Do you mean to say you did not tell Mr. Dean, when Carr went with you upon the previous occasions, that the shares for which Carr signed were yours?—I do not recollect it.

17613. Will you undertake to say you did not?—No.

17614. You saw Poulton sign?—Yes.

17615. That was in another room?—It was not in Mr. Dean's room.

 17616. Did

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

11 May 1837.

17616. Did you see anybody in the clerk's room whom you knew?—I am not sure whether, at that time, it was not that Mr. Sutton came in; I think it was.

17617. While Poulton was signing?— While I was there.

17618. And Carr?—Yes.

17619. Where did you pay the premium, whatever it was, you were to give to Carr?—I paid it the same day he got the shares.

17620. After the third transaction?—Yes.

17621. £. 5.?—I do not recollect what it was; it might have been 5 *l.*; I do not say what it was or was not.

17622. Have you any recollection at all?—No.

17623. You made no minute of it?—I dare say I have.

17624. *Chairman.*] You do recollect paying him money?—Yes.

17625. Mr. *Austin.*] Is it possible there may be a minute of it in your books in the course of business?—Yes, I have no doubt of it.

17626. And you knew what you were coming here to be examined for?—Yes, I gave a pretty broad guess.

17627. Did you look at your books?—No.

17628. Did you consult the state of your memory before you came?—No.

17629. Have you not written a petition about this?—Yes.

17630. Did you not tell a story in that petition?—Tell a story!

17631. Did you not make a statement?—Yes, I made some sort of statement.

17632. Did you not, in making that statement, find your memory was defective, as it has turned out to be to-day?—No.

17633. Did you look at your books before you made the statement in the petition?—No.

17634. I suppose your books may be and are in existence?—Very likely they are.

17635. What are the books in which you suppose you may have made the entry of the sum of 5*l.*; is it a journal?—My entries are made in a book which I call a jobbing-book.

17636. And your jobbing-book you can produce?—Yes.

17637. Mr. *Austin.*] It is in existence?—Yes; I think it is.

17638. When did you see it last?—I cannot say.

17639. When did you job last?—The probability is, there was a cheque given for the money, or the money drawn out by a cheque.

17640. Is that the only answer you choose to give to the question, that you do not know what you paid him?—No, I do not distinctly recollect what I paid him.

17641. *Chairman.*] Do you think it was much more or much less than 5*l.*?—For the whole transaction?

17642. Yes.—I should think it was more than 5*l.*, at different times.

17643. Do those different sums apply to those three Brighton Railway transactions?—Yes.

17644. Had you ever any other transactions with Carr and Poulton?—I do not recollect any.

17645. What do you mean by the different times you speak of?—The three times I have spoken of?

17646. If Carr has said he received 5*l.* of you for doing this job, should you doubt it?—I believe he did receive it.

17647. Should you doubt the accuracy of his statement, if it was 5*l.*?—I should rely upon that statement.

17648. Do you know how much he gave Poulton?—I only know what I have heard since.

17649. From whom?—I think it was in the petition of Poulton.

17650. You did not know at the time what he gave?—No.

17651. You left the matter entirely to his discretion?—Yes.

17652. When did you get the blue certificates in exchange for white ones that had been left upon this third occasion?—I left the white ones at that time.

17653. I assume that in my question; when did you get the blue certificates for the white ones left upon that occasion?—It might have been a fortnight afterwards.

17654. Did you go yourself for them?—Yes.

17655. With the money in your pocket?—Yes.

17656. Alone?—Yes.

17657. To the office in the Poultry?—Yes.

17658. Did you see Mr. Dean there?—Yes.

17659. Did you present yourself to Mr. Dean?—I went with that order.

17660. What order?—The order I had of his to receive the shares.

17661. What order?—Merely a memorandum,

17662. Signed by whom?—Signed by Mr. Dean.

17663. Have you got that order now?—No; I gave him the order in exchange for the certificates.

17664. You gave the order to him?—Yes.

17665. Did you read that order at any time between the time you originally got it and when you presented it?—I think it very likely I did.

17666. Who gave you that order?—I cannot recollect whether Carr gave it me, or Mr. Dean.

17667. Did you see Mr. Dean make out the order at the time?—Yes, he wrote the order in my presence, as far as I can recollect.

17668. He was sitting at the desk at that time?—Yes.

17669. With pen and ink before him?—Yes; all those things were there.

17670. And, according to your recollection, he wrote the order at the time?—Yes.

17671. Have you any doubt about it?—No.

17672. When he wrote it, did he not hand it to somebody?—Yes.

17673. To whom?—Either to Carr or to myself; I believe so.

17674. Who handed over the certificates to him?—Carr, I believe.

17675. Was it after this the deed was signed by Poulton?—After I received this memorandum?

17676. Yes.—No; the deed had been signed.

17677. At that time?—Yes.

17678. Did Poulton or Carr carry any authority from Mr. Dean's room into the deed-room to enable Poulton to sign?—I do not recollect.

17679. Did Poulton merely present himself at the table where the deed was, to sign it; I want to know if there was any authority?—I do not recollect what occurred now.

17680. You came back with Poulton?—Yes, I rather think he walked back with me; I cannot say whether he did.

17681. You say Carr had presented the certificates to Mr. Dean, or handed them over; did you count those that Carr presented to Mr. Dean?—Yes.

17682. That was before Poulton signed the deed?—No; the shares were counted by some one in the office where the deed lay for signature.

17683. And Poulton signed there?—Yes.

17684. And then Carr went into the other office with you, and handed over the shares to Mr. Dean?—Yes.

17685. Then the money was paid over?—I cannot say; I have some indistinct recollection of some portion of them not being paid upon at the time.

17686. Was that the time, whatever it was?—Yes.

17687. And then the order was given to Mr. Carr or to you?—Yes.

17688. And whether given to Mr. Carr or to you, it found its way into your possession?—Yes.

17689. Be so good as to tell me the terms of that order?—It was to the effect that the bearer would receive the new shares upon the presentation of that order, and upon payment of the deposit-money.

17690. Now then you went afterwards, about a fortnight, with that order in your possession, and alone?—Yes, I think I went at two different times, and got portions of them.

17691. That you did about a fortnight afterwards?—Yes, I do not think it was much more; I think it was the same month, whatever it was; I think it was in January.

17692. And you saw Mr. Dean again?—Yes.

17693. Did Mr. Dean know your name?—I do not know; he might have known my name, from having seen me sign the receipt.

17694. What receipt?—I signed for Poulton; upon receiving the shares, I said, received for Poulton, and signed my own name afterwards.

17695. Then Mr. Dean had an opportunity of seeing your name there?—Yes, he had.

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

11 May 1837.

17696. Then you went and got the scrip from Mr. Dean, the new scrip?—Yes.

17697. That is the whole of the transaction, is it; you paid the whole of the money when you got the certificates?—Yes.

17698. Then, in fact, however you may use the words 'give' or 'lend,' Carr has never had a single penny of yours that did not go for the payment of the deposits or the reward to him and Poulton for doing this business?—Yes.

17699. Is not that so?—Yes, I had nothing to do with Poulton.

17700. Carr is not your debtor now?—No.

17701. And never was your debtor after you got the blue certificates?—No.

17702. Do you know Henry Cooke?—Yes.

17703. Son of William Cooke?—I do not know who he is the son of.

17704. Do you know he is in Whitecross-street prison for debt?—I have heard he was.

17705. He was not a man of much substance?—I should think not.

17706. He was a man of the same kidney as Carr?—I know very little of him.

17707. Did you not know that his circumstances were of the same description as Carr's; he was a stock-jobber?—He was something of that sort.

17708. And his circumstances were of the same description as Carr's, were not they?—I cannot say.

17709. *Chairman.*] You know he was in indifferent circumstances?—Yes.

17710. Mr. *Austin.*] You knew he was in bad circumstances?—I did not know he was in bad circumstances; I knew nothing of his circumstances.

17711. Did you ever hear of anybody in bad circumstances?—Yes, very likely I may.

17712. From the same means, do you not know that Cooke was in bad circumstances?—I did not know it.

17713. Did you not know it at the time?—I did not know it.

17714. Did you not believe he was not in good circumstances?—I did not believe him to be a rich man.

17715. Did you not consider him a fit man to be applied to for such a purpose?—I do not know there was any particular fitness in it, whether he was a rich or a poor man.

17716. Did you apply to Henry Cooke upon any occasion about Rennie's Brighton shares?—Yes.

17717. At what time did you make this application?—I do not recollect.

17718. At what time, about what time?—I could not say.

17719. You can recollect nothing now; do try and recollect?—I cannot recollect.

17720. Was it the beginning of this year, or the end of last?—I should think it was the end of the last year.

17721. What was your application to Mr. Cooke?—It was to obtain me those new shares in exchange for the old ones.

17722. How many shares were there?—Between 100 and 200.

17723. Did you give him the certificates?—Yes.

17724. The white ones?—Yes.

17725. And the deposit-money?—Yes, I gave him the money.

17726. Did you give it to him or lend it to him?—I put it into his hands, and lent it to him for the time being.

17727. Did he go and procure your certificates?—He brought me the certificates in the course of the afternoon.

17728. Did you go with him?—No.

17729. Did you sign the deed for those certificates?—No.

17730. Do you know that he did?—I do not know it positively.

17731. Did you not intend him to do it?—I do not think he did.

17732. What sum did you give him for doing that business?—It might be 1*l.* or 30*s.*, to do that transaction.

17733. Was not it a part and parcel of the consideration he was to give you for the 1*l.* or 30*s.*, that he was to sign the deed?—I made no stipulation that he was to sign the deed.

17734. Would you have given it him without his doing it?—All I wanted was the new shares.

17735. Did

17735. Did you not want the deed signed as well?—I could not get them without the deed was signed.

17736. Was not it part and parcel of the stipulation that he should sign the deed?—I did not consider about that.

17737. Have you any doubt he did sign the deed?—I think it very likely he did.

17738. *Chairman.*] Did you not say you would rather burn your shares than sign the deed yourself?—Yes.

17739. Mr. *Austin.*] It is painful to press you upon this subject in this way; what did you do with the blue certificates you got from Mr. Cooke?—They are most likely sold.

17740. How much was it you got altogether that Mr. Cooke signed for you?—I do not recollect.

17741. As you have dealt in these shares in Rennie's Brighton line to some little extent, can you recollect what the price of these shares was?—At what period?

17742. At the time you got the exchange made.—Which?

17743. Take them one after the other?—Upon the last occasion I think they were worth no more than 2*s.* 6*d.* or 5*s.* a share.

17744. At what time was that?—Some time in January.

17745. Was not it about the 18th of January that they were worth 2*s.* 6*d.* a share?—It was some time in January; I cannot say it was the 18th.

17746. Was not it about the middle of the month?—I think it was.

17747. *Chairman.*] That is, the scrip was worth 2*s.* 6*d.*?—Yes, the white scrip; that was the last day of payment, when a call had been made.

17748. Mr. *Austin.*] What was it worth when that amount was paid; what was the blue scrip worth?—There was rather a preference given to the new.

17749. It was not worth much more?—It was worth more; it was at a discount.

17750. Was it worth 22*s.* 6*d.*?—Yes, it was worth rather more than 1*l.*; more than the old are.

17751. After the 17th or 18th, what was the value of the white scrip?—I do not think there was any price for the white scrip.

17752. Was it worth anything at all?—If I had any of it, I should consider not.

17753. I think 207 shares was the number that Mr. Cooke transacted for you?—I do not recollect.

17754. Will you look for the jobbing-book you speak of, to see if you can find it?—What is it you want?

17755. I want to see it.—This particular transaction?

17756. No, I want to see the book.—If I can find it, I have no objection whatever to produce it.

17757. You say you know Mr. Robert Sutton?—Yes.

17758. He was a director?—Yes.

17759. Do you know any other director of the railway?—No, I did not at that time.

17760. Have you known any of the directors of the railway since?—Not by name; I have seen one or two I have been told were directors.

17761. Have you had any conversation with them?—Yes, I think I have spoken to them.

17762. Where?—I have spoken to them in the passage here, in the last day or two.

17763. Have you seen them anywhere else; any of the directors?—Yes.

17764. Just try; have you seen them upon some other occasions?—Yes.

17765. Where have you seen them?—At their office over the way.

17766. When?—About a fortnight since, I think.

17767. In Westminster here?—Yes.

17768. Who were those directors you saw upon that occasion?—I saw Mr. Sutton.

17769. Sutton the younger?—Mr. Robert Sutton.

17770. Who else?—I did not know the names of any of them.

17771. You saw them at the office of the company?—Yes.

17772. You did not know the name of another director who was present?—No, I did

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

11 May 1837.

I did not, I could not mention the name; if I heard the name mentioned, I could say, perhaps.

17773. Were they introduced to you or brought to your notice as directors of the company?—Yes, I supposed them to be such.

17774. Was Mr. Dean there?—I saw him in the room once or twice.

17775. Were you in the room upon one occasion or two?—Only one occasion.

17776. Cannot you give me the date as to that occasion?—No, I cannot.

17777. How came you to go there?—I went there respecting a petition.

17778. What petition was it you went there about?—Do you want to know the contents of the petition?

17779. No; what was the petition you went about, by whom presented?—I went there merely to state my sentiments upon the transaction that had occurred.

17780. How came you to go; how came you to go to the office of the directors?—Mr. Sutton wished us to petition the Commons; that is, to draw up a petition of some kind or other.

17781. Who do you mean by us?—We three who were concerned.

17782. Frith, Whitten, and you?—Yes.

17783. You accordingly went to draw a petition?—We took the petition with us.

17784. Who drew it?—We drew it amongst ourselves.

17785. Where was the petition drawn?—The identical petition?

17786. Where was the petition drawn that was drawn by you three?—I believe at Mr. Sutton's office.

17787. Which Mr. Sutton's office?—At the offices over the way, the offices of the company.

17788. You do not mean at Mr. Robert Sutton junior's office?—I mean the offices over the way belonging to the company.

17789. They are solicitors of the company?—Yes.

17790. It was at the company's office?—Yes.

17791. Who was present when you drew the petition?—Mr. Sutton, the solicitor, was present.

17792. Who else?—One or two more gentlemen.

17793. Who procured the materials for you; they were upon the table, I suppose?—There were materials there.

17794. Who penned the petition?—Mr. Sutton.

17795. From your dictation?—From the rough sketch we had got.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

17796. Upon the solemn obligation of your honour and credit, do you mean to pretend or to say that Mr. Robert Sutton had any the slightest knowledge of any of the transactions between you and Carr and Poulton?—As far as I know, I should say not.

17797. You have spoken to various occasions when you were at the office of the company when Mr. Dean was there; upon the same honour, do you mean to represent that Mr. Dean had any knowledge of your transactions as connected with Poulton and Carr?—I do not know that he had.

17798. You have spoken of several occasions when you exchanged the scrip in the manner and by the hands you have described, you have spoken of an order you had in the handwriting of Mr. Dean; was that upon the third occasion or upon the occasion, whichever it was, and you do not seem to be certain which it was, on which you did not furnish the whole of the money, and upon which you exchanged the scrip or promised to exchange the scrip?—I do not understand you.

17799. There was one occasion when you did not furnish all the money to exchange the scrip?—Yes.

17800. Was it upon that occasion that you received the order from Mr. Dean, or that Carr received the order from Mr. Dean, entitling him to receive that scrip upon payment of the difference?—Yes.

17801. Do you know whether my learned friend's clients here have been subpœnaed or summoned, Mr. Whitten or Mr. Frith?—Yes.

17802. They

17802. They have, have they?—Yes.

17803. Are they here, do you know?—Mr. Frith is here, I believe.

17804. Can you tell the Committee how many shares in this company you were the holder of at the time you first negotiated with Mr. Carr?—No, I do not think I could.

17805. Or where you got them from?—Yes, I can ascertain that; I had more one hour than another; I might have very few at one part of the day, and at another hour a great many, I being a dealer in them.

17806. How long have you been a member of the Stock Exchange yourself?—About nine years.

17807. Excuse me for asking, are you a man of property yourself?—I do not know whether I am obliged to answer that; I shall not answer it.

17808. I shall not press it, if you object to it; were you a dealer or speculator in other shares besides this line of railway?—Yes.

17809. And other railway shares?—Yes, other railway shares, of almost every description.

17810. Were they matters of traffic in the market, as well as other descriptions of shares?—Yes, many of the railways.

17811. Had you any of Stephenson's?—I do not know that I had at that time; I have had Stephenson's.

17812. My learned friend has asked you about some particular period you have specified, when you say that the shares of the direct London and Brighton Company were worth 2*s.* 6*d.* the white scrip?—Yes.

17813. Do you know what amount of deposit had been paid upon Mr. Stephenson's shares?—£. 5.

17814. Can you tell the Committee, it is a matter of curiosity, what was the value of Stephenson's shares at the time these were worth 2*s.* 6*d.*?—At a guess, I should think from 1 to 3 premium; but I do not bind myself they were worth 6 *l.* or 7 *l.*

17815. What are they worth now?—About 30*s.* per share.

17816. Upon which 5 *l.* have been paid?—Yes.

17817. Can they be sold readily at that price?—No, I should think not.

17818. Can any sale be effected upon them in the market now?—Yes.

17819. At about what price?—They have been effecting sales at about 1 *l.* a share lately.

17820. You have been asked about the petition, the rough copy of which you three prepared, and took to the office of the company in Bridge-street?—

Mr. *Austin* said he did not mean to rely upon the circumstance of that petition.

17820.* Mr. *Clarkson.*] I have asked you distinctly upon the subject of Mr. Sutton, and also of Mr. Dean; I will run the risk of asking you this question, Is there any other officer of the company, director or otherwise, to your knowledge, that had any notion whatever of your concerns, bad or good, with Carr and Poulton?—Certainly not, to my knowledge.

17821. But, if I understand you, the reason you have assigned, and the only one, is, you employed persons you had reason to believe were persons worthless, that you might escape the liability that would follow from your subscribing the deed?—Yes, if I did subscribe; but I never made it a question with myself whether I should sign it or not.

[The Witness withdrew.

Veneris, 12° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. Forster.
Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. A. Chapman.	Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Rowe* called for the production of the memorandum referred to by Mr. Huckvale.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated that the memorandum was not in existence, but that the fullest evidence should be given upon the subject when Mr. Dean was again called.

Mr. *Robert Huckvale*, was again called in; and further Examined, as follows:

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

12 May 1837.

17821*. Mr. *Rowe.*] YOU mentioned yesterday a book which you called your jobbing-book, in which you were in the habit of making entries?—Yes.

17822. Have you had the goodness to bring it?—I have not got it by me, nor any one, except the one I have in use; I thought I might have some memorandums relating to the transaction, but I have not.

17823. What we asked for was the jobbing-book contemporaneous in time with these transactions?—I have not got it.

17824. Have you any jobbing-book in your possession in which you made memoranda and entries in January last?—No.

17825. You have not got it?—No; I generally destroy them when they are full; it is a little memorandum book. I can show you one that is similar to it.

17826. When did your present jobbing-book begin? [*The Witness produced a memorandum book.*]—There are some transactions the latter end of February.

17827. Will you give me the date of the first transaction you have in that book?—February the 1st; that is copied from some old memorandum.

17828. So that in point of fact you have a book that commences the 1st of February, but you have not the one that terminates the last day of January?—No; and I should not have this in my possession after it was filled; you can see the manner in which it is kept.

[*The evidence of the Witness given yesterday upon the subject of his jobbing-book was read.*]

17829. Having given us that evidence yesterday, you see that yesterday you stated that the book was in existence?—I did so say.

17830. Is it in existence? You say you think it is not. I ask you, that being so, can you recollect when that book was destroyed?—No; I most likely destroyed it among a great number of other memorandums. My memorandums are generally memorandums for the day. I may have a lot by me, or I may not have one.

17831. Have you any transactions in that book you have now produced which refer to the month of January?—I think one refers to the month of January; but it is one or two transactions copied from the old book.

17832. Have the goodness to mention those transactions, and give me the date.—[*The book produced by the Witness was handed to the Chairman.*]

Chairman.] It appears to be a very regular sort of journal.

17833. Mr. *Rowe.*] Have the goodness to point out the transactions which you say have been copied from some other book?—There is one [*pointing it out*].

17834. That is copied from another book?—Yes.

17835. Have the goodness to tell me why it was copied from another book into this?—Because the transactions were remaining unsettled.

17836. You have been on the Exchange nine or ten years?—Yes.

17837. Is

17837. Is it not the usual practice among members of the Stock Exchange to keep books?—Many do, and many do not. Brokers always keep entries of every transaction; I only commenced what is technically called jobbing last spring; a twelvemonth ago, and since that I have adopted quite a different way of keeping my accounts; I used formerly to post all my transactions in a ledger; but as a jobber I found it merely in my way, a book is of no use.

17838. Do you mean, in your business it is not necessary to refer to those entries from time to time?—No, not after the bargains are all concluded; it is only a sort of memorandum on a loose piece of paper, and I burn it the moment the cheque is received or paid.

17839. You do business on the Exchange in a large way?—I do not say in a large way; you see the transactions I have there.

17840. Do you not carry on business in a largish way at the Exchange, and have done for the last eight or nine years?—No, I have carried on business in a very small way.

17841. Do you not know it to be a generally allowed practice on the Exchange to keep those books for the purpose of reference?—I cannot say what other parties do, except those I was first with; they were brokers, and I kept my accounts in the same way at first.

17842. *Chairman.*] Have you destroyed all your books antecedent to the 1st of February?—I have got several old books.

17843. Have you destroyed all your jobbing books before the 1st of February?—As far as I know, I have.

17844. How many jobbing books had you antecedent to the 1st of February?—It is only a slip of paper put in a case, I could say.

17845. Have you any prior to the 18th, the 27th, and the 28th of January; have you any in November?—I do not know that I have any in existence prior to this.

17846. Mr. *Rowe.*] You stated, yesterday, you could not exactly state the amount of the shares?—Yes.

17847. Supposing those shares that had been signed for by Carr to the amount——

Mr. *Clarkson* admitted, in order to save time, that the representation of Carr as to the number of shares he was employed in procuring, by himself and in conjunction with Mr. Poulton, for Mr. Huckvale, was a fair representation; and it was further admitted that that number amounted to 1,829.

Witness.]—According to my present recollection, Cooke procured for me 150 new shares.

17848. Taking it to be established that about 2,000 of those Rennie's shares went through your hands at that time, do you mean to tell this Committee you have kept no memorial of any kind with regard to those shares; and you have no memorial by you?—No, not further than the parties I purchased from. They were inserted in my cash book as a check against them.

17849. Will it appear in your cash book from whom you purchased those shares?—Yes; it merely states what the sums were.

17850. Will it appear in your cash book from whom you purchased those shares?—The name will appear, but there is nothing attached to it to show it was Rennie's shares, or anything else.

17851. Are you capable of pointing out, by the contents of your cash book, that the shares were Rennie's shares?—No.

17852. *Chairman.*] Knowing the number of the shares which in the three separate transactions with Carr you obtained through him, and the amount of money which you would have given him on those three occasions, cannot you, from the amount of money entered in your cash book, make out from whom it was you obtained the shares?—No; I could not ascertain that. I most likely bought the shares in small portions, at different times; but most of the transactions Mr. Frith had to do with, he bought the shares, and gave me the scrip and the money at the time.

17853. Is the cash book in existence?—Yes, it is.

The Witness was directed to produce his cash book and the bankers' book on Friday next at 11 o'clock.

Mr. R. Huckvale.

12 May 1837.

Witness.] As far as relates to those payments made to Carr on the last day, you will find it cleared up by Mr. Frith. Mr. Frith gave me a cheque on the last day for 5 *l.*; I think it was; I am almost sure of it; he gave it into my hand, and I paid it to Carr; and that will be found, but at the time I made no entry.

17854. It being established that a certain number of shares were in your possession, we wish to know the way you obtained those shares?—If I could do it; I must give you the brokers' names I purchased the shares of, in order to do it.

17855. Mr. *Rowe.*] With regard to your carrying on business, how long have you been a broker?—I suppose about eight years.

17856. How long have you been a jobber?—About twelve months I have given my attention to it.

17857. According to the practice of the Exchange, if any person with whom you have a transaction becomes a defaulter, can you recover without the original memorial, such a document as this?—While the transactions were unclosed I kept the memorandum; but when they are once closed, or when a man becomes a defaulter, it has nothing to do with it.

17858. Do you mean to tell the Committee you have no transactions that took place in the month of January last, or December in the last year, 1836, which are not closed?—I have not any open for the last month.

17859. Have you any open for the last year?—Certainly not.

17860. Or in the month of January?—No.

17861. Have you any other books of this description, or is it the book of the month of January of that description which is missing?—My transactions for the last twelve months have been all written down upon rough memorandums, which I burn as soon as they are over.

17862. Then am I to understand that all your previous books are destroyed down to this?—Yes; that is the only one I have.

17863. You said you could not call to recollection when you saw the book of January last?—No; most likely I burnt it when it was filled up; I am constantly burning papers. I wrote more on slips of paper than in any other way.

17864. You say there are open transactions copied into this book; those were not closed?—No, I keep them in this book.

17865. Were they open at the time that this book was commenced?—Yes, they were; I will explain that to you: March 11th is the first transaction I appear to have had in this book, but this transaction was outstanding; it was for a very distant period; and when it is closed, I mark it off.

17866. I wish to know with regard to one entry; take any one you please which has been copied from the other book into this; was the transaction to which that relates closed at the time of copying?—No; if it had been, I should not have copied it.

17867. It being so, supposing the party with whom the transaction took place to have become a defaulter, could you have recovered upon that copy, according to the practice of the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

17868. Now, I ask you as a jobber practising on the Exchange, do you not know, in order to recover from a defaulter upon a transaction in the Exchange, that it is necessary you should show to the committee of the Stock Exchange the original document?—No, I should make a claim, and that is all that is required.

17869. I ask you whether, according to the practice of the Exchange, you can recover from a defaulter without producing the original document?—Yes; I never produced any document for the purpose in my life; I was never called upon.

17870. I do not ask you that?—I do not know what you mean by the question you put.

17871. Are you not aware it is the established practice of the Stock Exchange, to recover from a defaulter, that the original document should be produced?—I say no.

17872. Will you allow me to refer you for one moment to your petition; you mentioned yesterday that you had on one occasion seen Mr. Robert Sutton at the office in the Poultry?—Yes, I have a perfect recollection of seeing him one time, but which time I cannot say.

17873. It was on one of the occasions when you went to the Poultry with Carr with those shares?—Yes.

17874. Do you recollect seeing him at any other time?—I think I saw him almost daily at the Stock Exchange.

17875. Did

17875. Did you see him more than once at the Stock Exchange?—I do not recollect it.

17876. Will you undertake to say you did not see him more than once at the office in the Poultry?—I do not think I saw him more than once; I saw him once.

17877. Will you undertake to say you did not see him more than once?—No.

17878. Were you ever at the office in the Poultry on other occasions than those you mentioned yesterday?—No; I never had occasion to go there at any other time; I never went on any other business, except to procure shares at the times I have mentioned.

17879. Will you undertake to say you were not there afterwards?—Only when I went to fetch away the shares.

17880. You produced the order of Mr. Dean, upon which he gave up the blue scrip; were you ever in the office afterwards; recollect yourself?—I think I may say never.

17881. Can you recollect whether you ever had any conversation with Mr. Robert Sutton, with regard to those shares, before you went to the office?—When I say I saw him, I passed him; I do not think he has known my name a month.

17882. Did you ever have any conversation with Mr. Robert Sutton prior to this transaction about these shares?—I have no recollection of it.

17883. Will you say you had not?—No further than giving him the price of shares. "What are Rennie's?" and I have said so and so.

17884. You know the partners of that house, Sutton and Gribble?—Yes.

17885. Have you had any conversation with any other partner?—No, never, except in answering any inquiry that they may make respecting the market, and the business doing in the day.

17886. With regard to this transaction, when you went to fetch the blue scrip, you say you produced an order; that order is not here; will you have the goodness to tell us, as nearly as you can, the effect of it?—The effect was, that upon the presentation of that order, and the payment of the deposit money of one pound per share, that the shares were to be given up to the bearer; I went for them myself.

17887. Can you recollect whether any name appeared upon that order?—Yes, I think the name of Poulton.

17888. Just have the goodness again to tell me how the name of Poulton was introduced, you say it occurred, in what way did it occur?—I have no distinct recollection whether Poulton's name was in it; I think it must be, because after receiving the shares, I received them for Poulton, and signed my name for them.

17889. Have you any doubt that the name of Poulton was upon that order?—I think it was.

17890. How did Poulton's name appear?—I do not know.

17891. Was it an order to deliver the shares up to Poulton?—I cannot say, or whether the name was inserted and bearer; but the effect was, if I went with this order I could get the shares, and that was all I troubled or cared for.

17892. Was it an order to deliver up certain shares that had been signed for in the name of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton?—I cannot say; I have no distinct recollection of the wording of it; I know what I expected, that I could go and claim the shares.

17893. Will you undertake to say it did not run in this way; that it was an order to deliver up certain shares, giving the numbers, from such a number to such a number, signed for in the name of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton?—I do not think there were any numbers inserted.

17894. Was not it an order to the effect to deliver 510 shares, signed for in the name of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, to the bearer?—I really do not recollect whether it was to the bearer or Poulton, or Poulton or bearer; I took it in the confidence that when I took it I could get the shares.

17895. I wish to know this, if there was any number to designate the shares, or how were those shares marked out, except that they were shares in the name of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton?—That I cannot say anything about.

17896. Have you any doubt, if there was no number to point out what the shares were, that the indication in the paper what the shares were, was, that they were the shares of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton?—I do not think the order indicated anything of the kind.

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

12 May 1837.

17897. Then, in what way was it pointed out to you or Mr. Dean what the shares were?—Only a certain number of shares, but no particular numbers; I have no recollection of any numbers being stated in the order.

17898. Can you recollect whether Poulton's name appeared in the body of the order, or was it a memorandum at the foot of it?—I think it was in the body of it.

17899. Have you not every reason to suppose that it ran thus: that it was an order to deliver up the shares belonging to, or signed for, by Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, or to bearer?—Yes; I understood it to be to that effect.

17900. Can you tell me, or have you any means of knowing, in the first place, at present, any of the persons to whom those shares were transferred afterwards?—I have no means, except by guess; the amount of money you will see in the bankers' book.

17901. By the best means in your power, can you tell through whom any of that blue scrip passed from you?—I think the greater part of it passed into the hands of Mr. Frith and Mr. Whitton direct from me.

17902. Have you ever jobbed in Rennie's shares for the house of Sutton?—I do not know; I might have done bargains with them; I do not think I have.

17903. Recollect yourself, they are extensive dealers on the Exchange, and a very respectable house?—Yes.

17904. Have you any doubt you have transacted business with Sutton's house for these Rennie's shares?—I do not think I had any transaction with them; I was not personally known at the time to the gentlemen; they go to the jobbers that are personally known to them. There are many of us, not so many as there were last year, but I can safely say I never did any transaction for the house of Sutton; I do not recollect ever doing a bargain with them of any description.

17905. On the Exchange, are there not parties well known, or were not there at one period of time, as dealers in railway shares particularly, as parties mixed up in that particular business?—Railroads generally?

17906. Yes.—There are several men who stand in the market ready to deal in those shares.

17907. Were not there individuals who had made that sort of dealing more particularly their business in railroad shares?—I do not recollect any one in particular.

17908. For instance, if you went upon the Exchange, if you wanted mining shares, would you not go to persons who were accustomed to deal in them?—I want persons to come to me; I do not go to them.

17909. If a person wanted mining shares he would go to certain parties?—Yes.

17910. And if he wanted railway shares he would go to another person?—Yes.

17911. Do you not state in your petition, you have been a dealer in shares in various railway companies?—Yes.

17912. That being so, recollect again, have you never done business with Sutton's house in those shares?—I do not think I ever had a transaction with Sutton's house of any description.

17913. I am not confining myself to Mr. Robert Sutton, but to the firm?—Yes; I understood it so.

17914. At the time you presented this order to Mr. Dean, and he delivered the shares to you, do you recollect what conversation passed?—No, I do not; I do not recollect any conversation in particular.

17915. You were at that time known to Mr. Dean, you had seen him several times?—I do not know that Mr. Dean knew me; I knew Mr. Dean as the secretary to this company, but whether he knew my name before I went with this order I do not know; he might have known my face, having seen me before.

17916. Have you any doubt that Mr. Dean knew at that time you were not Benjamin Wheeler Poulton?—I would not say he knew it; I have no reason to know it; I do not know that my name was mentioned to him.

17917. Were not you the party who made the arrangement with Mr. Dean, according to your statement of yesterday, and who stated that the shares were yours and not Poulton's, and left them in his hands for a fortnight?—Yes; at that time.

17918. At the time when that arrangement was made, it was antecedent to the time you received the shares from Mr. Dean, a fortnight at least?—Yes; I fetched the shares away in a fortnight.

17919. Having drawn your attention to that fact, that you were the party that made that arrangement, and that that conversation took place, have you any doubt that

that Mr. Dean knew you were not Benjamin Wheeler Poulton?—I should say he did know.

17920. *Chairman.*] You were there with Poulton and Carr?—Yes; but as he was not present when the deed was signed, I do not know that he knew which I was, or which Poulton was.

17921. Mr. *Rowe.*] Now allow me to read this answer to you:—"Did you tell Dean on this occasion," (that is, when you went with Carr and Poulton,) "that Poulton was come to sign for him? No. Did Mr. Dean know it? I have not allowed he had come to sign for me. Did you tell him you were come with your scrip, to get the scrip transferred? I do not recollect anything of the sort. How did you represent the transaction to him? I represented to him that the scrip was mine." This was your answer of yesterday, as to the time you were there with Carr and Poulton; that being so, having represented to Mr. Dean that the scrip was yours and not Poulton's when the arrangement was made, have you any doubt when you came back a fortnight afterwards that Mr. Dean well knew you were not Benjamin Wheeler Poulton?—I should think he knew it, because the receipt was signed by me for Poulton.

17922. Having refreshed your memory upon this point, have the goodness to tell me whether your memory was equally good upon those transactions, when you embodied this in your petition: "That in the above transaction, your petitioners did not consider that they were doing anything wrong, or infringing any rule of your Honourable House; and if your petitioners had known that any of the above transactions acted wrong, or against the rules of your Honourable House, your petitioners exceedingly regret it; and they most distinctly declare, that the directors of the said company, or their officers or agents, or any of them, in no way participated therein;" at the time you embodied that in your petition in Mr. Sutton's office in Parliament-street, was your memory as fresh upon these points as it is now?—Yes.

17923. Mr. *Clarkson.*] I think you told my learned friend, either yesterday or to-day, you have been a dealer in railway shares in almost all the companies that have existed?—A great many; there are a great many that have never been in the market.

17924. Have you ever subscribed to any deed?—Yes.

17925. What deed have you ever subscribed?—I subscribed to the deed of the London and Southampton and Portsmouth Junction.

17926. Any other?—No other.

17927. Were you ever the holder of any shares in the Birmingham Railway?—No.

17928. I am asking you quite upon speculation, I do not know whether you have or not; have you ever been the holder of any shares in any company that had obtained an Act of Parliament, and upon which you have not been a subscriber to the deed?—Yes.

17929. Have you ever been a proprietor of shares in any railway company that has since obtained an Act, before they obtained the Act, without signing the deed?—Yes, a great many.

17930. I think you said Sutton and Gribble's house, on the Stock Exchange, is a very honourable and extensive dealing house?—Yes, as far as I know; I never had any transactions with them.

17931. That is in railways?—Yes.

17932. They are not persons who have transactions outside the house, or in the Rotunda?—No, I never heard anything of the kind of them.

17933. Mr. *Rowe.*] When you held all those shares, were not you of the opinion you stated yesterday, that you would rather have burnt your fingers than put your name to the deeds, with the exception of the Southampton deed and the Portsmouth Junction?—Not to any deed; I said I would rather have burnt the shares than have subscribed the Parliamentary deed.

17934. Do you mean to say, you would rather have burnt the shares than have subscribed to Rennie's deed?—Yes, that is what I mean.

17935. *Chairman.*] What was the peculiarity belonging to Rennie's deed which would have led you rather to have burnt those shares than have put your name to it?—On account of the great competition among so many different lines.

[The Witness withdrew.

Henry Cooke, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Henry Cooke.

12 May 1837.

17936. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the person whose name appears on the subscription list of Rennie's deed, as Mr. Henry Cooke, of No. 8, Houndsditch, gentleman?—Yes.

17937. I see you are first entered on the list as a Mr. Henry Cooke, No. 8, Houndsditch, gentleman, 125 shares. Did you subscribe your name for it?—Yes, I believe that was about the amount; I cannot swear to the amount, but I believe it is.

17938. Will you be good enough to tell me whose property those shares were?—Yes, those are the largest number; they were the property of Mr. James Whitten, of the Stock Exchange.

17939. Where did you execute the deed for those shares?—In Chapel-court, or Chapel-place, Poultry.

17940. Do you recollect about what time?—The deed itself probably will show that; as far as my recollection serves, I will tell you the time; I think it was about four months ago, or probably less, not more than that.

17941. Was it in the month of January?—I think in the month of January in this year.

17942. Where did Mr. Whitten give you those shares, was it before you went to the Poultry?—Yes.

17943. Did he go with you?—No; he gave them to me on the Stock Exchange.

17944. Was Mr. Huckvale present at that time?—I cannot state; he might have been. I do not recollect that he was. I do not think he was.

17945. Did Mr. Whitten give you money at that time?—I must have had money from Mr. Whitten; and I think he gave it me to pay up the shares. I do not think I had any money of my own.

17946. You say Mr. Whitten gave you scrip; did he give you the old scrip; was it something similar to that? [*handing the white scrip to the Witness.*]—Yes.

17947. Filled up in a different way, but similar to this?—Yes.

17948. For 125?—Yes.

17949. He gave you money to pay for them?—Yes, I think so, from the circumstance of my not having the money at the time.

17950. You had not the means?—No; I might have had it, but I do not think I had it at that time.

17951. You were not in very flourishing circumstances?—No more than I am now.

17952. You have come from Whitecross-street Prison?—Yes, I have.

17953. Have the goodness to give us the amount of the debt you are now actually in prison for?—£. 34.

17954. Can you tell me when you were taken upon that debt?—Yes; the 1st of April.

17955. I may as well ask you, were you applied to in Whitecross-street Prison by Mr. Leman to give information?—I did not know the gentleman; that is the gentleman [*pointing to Mr. Leman*].

17956. To give information upon this point?—Yes.

17957. You declined at first altogether?—Yes.

17958. You gave a reason, did you not?—Yes, I did; that the gentleman was a stranger to me, and I did not think it was right. I asked him this question: Were I to come to him, let him be in the prison, and I in his situation, would he give me any information?

17959. And, in point of fact, you gave none?—No, I did not.

17960. You say Mr. Whitten gave you the scrip, and you have no doubt he gave you money; what were your directions; to go where?—My directions were not to go anywhere; but to bring him back saleable articles. I will explain.

17961. Did Mr. Whitten say that the white was not saleable?—"I want the deed to be signed; and when you have signed the deed, paid the money, they would give you an article which, upon the Stock Exchange, was transferable."

17962. *Chairman.*] Did you understand where you were to go to get the saleable

saleable article?—Yes, perfectly; but Mr. Whitten did not know whether I should go where they had the saleable articles, or whether I should employ anybody else.

17963. Mr. *Rowe.*] What was he to give you for this negotiation to produce a saleable article?—There was no negotiation; but he did give me 30 *s.*

17964. Tell me what you did bring back to him; did you bring back 125 of these papers; [*blue papers*]?—Yes.

17965. Where did you bring them from?—In Chapel-court, in the Poultry.

17966. What did you do when you came there?—I saw an individual I supposed to be the secretary; at any rate he was a man in office there. I put down the amount of shares, and I believe the money. I am sure I put down the money requisite to pay upon them the additional deposit; and it was in return for which he gave me those certificates, first having signed the deed.

17967. Did all this take place in one room; do you recollect that?—On the first occasion I think it did; but I am not sure.

17968. You produced the scrip, and paid the money, and signed the deed?—Yes, I think so.

17969. I am confining myself to the 125 shares; the first time did you see more than one party, or did you go into more than one room?—I cannot state even that; I do not know.

17970. You went afterwards?—Yes, subsequently, to sign for some more.

17971. Upon other occasions when you went, did you go into more rooms than one?—Yes.

17972. Recollect whether you went into more rooms than one on the first occasion?—I cannot.

17973. You have seen that gentleman you suppose to have been the secretary more than once?—Yes, I think I did on the second occasion, and perhaps since that.

17974. I find your name standing again, Henry Cooke, Houndsditch, gentleman, 100 shares, 7,500 *l.*?—Yes, that was the amount I believe; that was the smaller amount.

17975. How long was it after the first visit to Chapel-place?—It may have been nearly a month; I think so.

17976. If the first visit was in January, that would bring it into February?—Yes.

17977. You say it was in this year?—Yes; I have no doubt it was.

17978. Cannot you fix the date of it?—No, I cannot; probably the deed will show it better than my recollection.

17979. Be so good as to tell the Committee whose property those 100 shares were?—Mr. Huckvale's.

17980. Did Mr. Huckvale deliver to you white scrip of that kind?—Yes.

17981. *Chairman.*] What did he say to you?—I cannot recollect the precise words; the purport of it was, I was to bring him back something; I knew what he meant. He did not know whether I should sign the deed or procure anybody else to do it.

17982. How do you mean he did not know that?—I said I could either sign the deed myself or get some other person to do it.

17983. Mr. *Rowe.*] You told him that?—Yes; I do not know that I did upon this occasion, but upon many occasions I have had transactions with him.

17984. Have you bargained with him?—Yes, I have.

17985. Have you signed deeds for him?—Yes; though, probably, not with his knowledge.

17986. You gave him to understand, that you would sign the deed yourself or get somebody else to do it?—Yes; or procure a saleable article.

17987. At that time did you not keep a jobbing-book?—Yes.

17988. Have you got it?—It is filed, or sent with a number of shares to the Insolvent Court; you can have the book itself.

17989. Would those transactions appear on the face of this book, and the date?—I cannot swear to that, but I think it would; and, probably, from the book, I could tell you the date.

17990. Did Mr. Huckvale give you money to pay the deposit on those shares?—Yes, I think he did, for the reason I have assigned as to Mr. Whitten.

17991. That you were incapable of paying the money at that time?—I did not say I was incapable, but I had not the means, or if I had, I would rather have the money from another party than pay it out of my own pocket.

17992. Did anything pass from Mr. Huckvale to you, as a premium for this

 accommodation?

Henry Cooke.

12 May 1837.

accommodation?—Yes; upon the return of the shares, those saleable articles, I received a sovereign from him.

17993. I see you state in your petition you never paid any deposit upon the shares; do you mean you never paid any from your own pocket?—Yes, that is another circumstance I go upon, that induces me to say that those parties gave me money to pay for the shares.

17994. Did you at any other time, either in person or by deputy, get this deed signed for other shares?—Occasionally, when I was engaged, or probably when I thought I had signed the deed for a sufficient amount, I used to get my father to sign.

17995. According to your notion of things, what did you think was a sufficient amount?—It was not so much the amount as the number of times; I had signed that twice.

17996. When you went the second time, did you see the same gentleman?—I imagine s.

17997. Do you know his name?—No, only that I have sent to inquire to serve him with a notice upon my schedule; and, as far as my information is correct, his name is Dean; I know nothing of the individual further than that.

17998. Do you remember what passed with that individual, whoever it was, the second time; you say you went into more rooms than one?—I cannot recollect what passed; some small talk; I do not recollect what it was.

17999. Recollect yourself; what was the first proceeding?—I cannot recollect.

18000. What did you do when you went into the room?—I cannot tell; I do not recollect.

18001. Did you produce your white scrip in the first room?—Undoubtedly.

18002. Did you sign the deed in the first room?—Yes.

18003. Did you pay the money in the first room?—Yes, I believe I did.

18004. What did you do in the second room?—On the first occasion I was not in the second room.

18005. Then, on the second occasion, did you show your scrip in the first room?—I cannot recollect that I had occasion to go into the second room; what was the cause I do not recollect; I did go into the second room.

18006. Did you sign the deed in the first or second room?—I think I signed the deed in the room in which I signed the first time.

18007. Whether it was the first or second room you cannot recollect?—No.

18008. To whom did you pay the money?—I paid it to an individual that appeared to be the secretary.

18009. Did you pay a cheque or cash?—In cash, notes or gold.

18010. Did you give your name to that party to whom you paid the money?—Undoubtedly, I must have given my name at the signing of the deed; whether he asked me my name previous to the signing the deed, I do not recollect.

18011. You have signed other deeds besides Rennie's deed?—Yes.

18012. Did you sign the Deptford and Dover deed?—Yes.

18013. To what amount?—I cannot recollect.

18014. Was it as much as nine or ten thousand pounds?—Very probably.

18015. Will you give me the name of any other deed you signed?—Yes, I can give you the name of Gibbs's Brighton Line.

18016. What did you sign besides?—I have signed, I think, other deeds; I have signed the Great Northern, which company has not obtained an Act of Parliament.

18017. It died an unnatural death last year?—I believe it did.

18018. Can you recollect any other you have signed?—I think I have signed other deeds, though I cannot at this moment recollect the others; I have signed so many, I do not think I can recollect.

18019. Do you mean to say you have signed so many you cannot particularize?—Yes, I do.

18020. Perhaps you were in the habit of signing by the hands of others as well as your own; when you thought you had signed enough, have you not procured other parties to sign this identical Rennie's deed?—Yes, I think I procured my father.

18021. And other parties?—No; I do not think I ever did.

18022. Can you particularize upon those occasions when you signed those deeds, or got them signed; did you receive a consideration for the job?—I think upon many occasions I may have done it; I think in some cases they were my own shares;

I had

I had bought them and sold them for some few days on; I have sold them as saleable articles.

18023. But when you did not sell those matters on your own account, when you were acting by commission for other parties, had you not a premium or consideration for the job?—Yes.

18024. *Chairman.*] Was there any regular commission; did you charge so much a share?—No; we had no regular commission.

18025. Mr. *Rowe.*] Did the commission depend upon the state of the market?—Yes, it might; I do not say I have never signed those deeds for nothing; I wish not to state that; I think I may on some occasions have done it to oblige a friend; I think it is possible.

18026. You say your father signed this deed for you once?—Yes.

18027. *Chairman.*] What was the room in which you got the blue certificates the second time?—I think it was in the large room.

18028. Was that the first or second room?—It strikes me it was in the second room upon the second occasion.

18029. Whom did you see there?—I believe the secretary.

18030. Was he in both the rooms?—Not at the same time.

18031. Mr. *Rowe.*] I think you said it was in the large room; was it in the large room you paid the money both times?—Yes, it was.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

18032. You saw two rooms, did you?—Yes.

18033. Did you go into any other than two rooms at any time?—Yes; I have been into three rooms.

18034. Is your memory at all to be depended upon, upon the question of whether, when you first went, you went only into one room, or you may have gone into two?—I think I may depend upon my memory that I went into one room only; I am sure I did.

18035. Have the goodness to tell me, as my learned friend has told you, of some companies that have died an unnatural death, can you tell the Committee whether you have signed any subscription deeds of any companies that have obtained their Acts?—If you will mention the name of any one, I will endeavour to tell you.

18036. Have you signed the Birmingham?—The Birmingham, Bristol, and Thames Junction.

18037. Have you signed that?—I think I have; but not the London and Birmingham, which you are inquiring about.

18038. Did you sign the London Grand Junction?—I cannot recollect.

18039. You may have done so?—It is possible.

18040. Did you sign the Southampton?—Not to my recollection; I think I might almost say positively I did not sign it.

18041. Did you sign the Northern and Eastern?—I do not recollect having signed it.

18042. Can you inform the Committee, for I am really guessing only, of any companies that have obtained their Acts of Parliament in which you have put your name to the deeds?—The Eastern Counties.

18043. Are there any others you can tell us that have been fortunate enough to obtain their Acts that you have signed?—I cannot.

18044. You say you signed this deed the first time, according to your recollection, in the beginning of this year?—Yes.

18045. Can you undertake to say, the first time you signed was not the 17th of November?—No, I cannot; I believe it was at the commencement of this year.

18046. Can you undertake to say you did not subscribe the deed the 17th of November?—No, I cannot.

18047. That is for the 125?—I cannot say.

18048. Can you undertake to say that the second time of your signing the deed was not in the month of January, the 14th of January?—I cannot; I have always believed it was within a month.

18049. I want to know whether you are accurate, or whether you may be mistaken?—It is very likely I may be mistaken as to the dates.

18050. You presented a petition to the House of Commons; who prepared it for you?—That individual that is there, Mr. Green.

Henry Cooke.

12 May 1837.

18051. How came you to find out Mr. Green?—I did not find him out; he found me out.

18052. Did he bring a draft of that petition to you to read over and sign it?—No; he brought nothing of that kind; he drew it up.

18053. *Chairman.*] While he was with you?—I was in the prison; I was not present when he wrote that petition; but I read it over before I signed it.

18054. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Did Mr. Green tell you whom he came from?—No.

18055. And you did not know?—No, I did not.

18056. Had you seen any gentleman before you saw Mr. Green?—I had seen Mr. Leman.

18057. Did Mr. Leman give you to understand that Mr. Green would wait upon you?—No.

18058. You did not expect to see Mr. Green before you saw him?—No.

18059. Did you agree with Mr. Leman you would sign the petition?—No.

18060. Did anything pass with Mr. Leman upon the subject of the petition?—No.

18061. State what did pass?—Mr. Leman was introduced to me by another individual, of the name of Poulton.

18062. I suppose that is Benjamin Wheeler Poulton?—That is the man. Of course I knew Mr. Poulton before.

18063. Poulton introduced Mr. Leman to you?—Yes.

18064. State what passed upon that occasion?—Poulton said, "Here is a gentleman from Messrs. Vizard and Leman." I did not know whether he was one of the firm; he was introduced as connected with the firm. Mr. Leman, who I understood came from them, said, "I perceive your name is upon Rennie's list for a very large amount; have you any objection to state under what circumstances you signed that deed?" I said almost immediately, if not immediately, "Supposing you were here a prisoner for debt, and I was to come to you as you have come to me, and asked you these or any other questions, what answer would you give?" I forget Mr. Leman's answer; but I can imagine it.

18065. Endeavour to recollect it?—I cannot.

18066. We will not have your imagination; what followed upon that?—He said, if not directly after what I have stated, in a short time, "If you do not choose to state it, you can be made to do it; you will be summoned before the Committee, and you will have to state it then." And I said it was time enough to do it then.

18067. Was there anything else passed?—Not to my knowledge.

18068. Recollect yourself; and tell us whether that was all that passed?—I think it very likely a good deal more did pass.

18069. I should like to know it?—If I cannot recollect, I cannot tell you.

18070. Doubtless; can you recollect or not?—No, I cannot; but that more did pass I have no doubt; but I cannot recollect it; there were more words.

18071. Was there anything more in the shape of substance?—Nothing more to my knowledge or recollection.

18072. Did Mr. Poulton say anything?—Yes.

18073. Let us know what he said?—Poulton said, "You had better tell what you know of the matter."

18074. What did you answer?—I said, I believe, that it was dangerous for a man to say anything, or write anything in such a place as that; and I had received instructions from my attorney not to do it.

18075. Did Mr. Leman tell you he was an attorney?—No, he did not, to my recollection.

18076. Try and tell us?—I do not think he did.

18077. Did he tell you he was the solicitor for a rival company?—No, he did not.

18078. Tell us what passed between you and Poulton?—I cannot recollect it; I dare say it was nothing of any consequence. I cannot recollect it.

18079. Nothing about his object in coming to you?—Nothing at all.

18080. Then, are the Committee to understand that you have told us, as well as your recollection serves you, the substance of the conversation you had upon being introduced at Whitecross-street to Mr. Leman;—Yes, they are.

18081. He was accompanied by Poulton, who ushered him in as Mr. Leman?—No, he did not.

18082. Did he not introduce him to you?—Yes, he did; but he did not state his

his name was Leman; he introduced him as a gentleman; but I was so muddled, that I could not distinctly understand him; but, so far as I understood him, he said, "Here is a gentleman from Vizard and Leman."

18083. *Chairman.*] Did you know who they were?—I had heard the name before that.

18084. Did you know it was a solicitor's firm?—Yes, I did.

18085. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Had you heard their names mentioned before as connected with Mr. Stephenson's line?—I may have seen it as I may have seen any lawyer's name.

18086. Will you undertake to say you did not know perfectly well whether the gentleman you saw was Mr. Leman or not; that Vizard and Leman were the solicitors for Stephenson's line?—I will undertake to say I did not know whether they were the solicitors to Mr. Stephenson's line, or Cundy's line, or Rennie's line.

18087. Do you mean that the Committee are to understand from you, that you knew that Messrs. Vizard and Leman were concerned for another railway to Brighton, but you did not know which it was?—I did not even know that they were concerned for a Brighton line at all; but I believed I had seen the names connected with a prospectus for some Brighton line.

18088. Did Poulton tell you that they were concerned for Stephenson's line?—He did not, to the best of my recollection.

18089. At no time?—If he did, I never attended to him.

18090. Or answered him?—Or answered him.

18091. That you are sure of?—I am accurate upon that.

18092. Are you quite sure?—No, I am not.

18093. Then you cannot say whether he did or not?—I am almost certain that he did not?

18094. Will you say to a certainty that he did not?—No, I will not; I cannot.

18095. I ask you whether Poulton told you in the presence of the gentleman, whoever he was, that Messrs. Vizard and Leman were the solicitors for Stephenson's line?—To the best of my recollection he did not.

18096. Will you undertake to say he did not, positively?—No, or I would have said so at first.

18097. Was the visit you have spoken to, the first visit you had had upon the subject of the petition?—Which visit do you allude to?

18098. The visit in Whitecross-street Prison?—I never had but one.

18099. Can you give me the date of the visit?—It was the same day that the petition was drawn up.

18100. Mr. Green drew up the petition?—Yes.

18101. Was Mr. Green in company with the parties who came to you?—I never saw Mr. Green with anybody.

18102. Mr. Green was not with you at the time that Poulton came to you with Mr. Leman?—No, he was not.

18103. How soon after they had left did Mr. Green come?—Probably the same day.

18104. I thought you said you signed the petition at the time you had the meeting in Whitecross-street?—I said I signed the petition the same day that Mr. Green came to me.

18105. Mr. Green came to you some days afterwards?—Yes.

18106. How many after?—Probably three or four, it might be only two.

18107. Had you seen anybody in the interim, that had arranged with you the substance of your petition?—No, I had not.

18108. Before Poulton and Mr. Leman left you, had you agreed or refused to sign any petition?—I have never been asked.

18109. Nothing passed about the petition on that occasion?—No, nothing.

18110. Then you were merely asked, whether you were the person whose name appeared as a subscriber to the deed for a large sum upon Rennie's line?—That was the substance; and whether I chose to state under what circumstances.

18111. And then Poulton said you had better, and you were then told by Mr. Leman you might be compelled to do so by summons?—I do not know whether the "then" is correctly placed, I do not know whether Poulton said so first or Mr. Leman.

18112. Then you were waited upon by Mr. Green?—Yes, some days afterwards.

Henry Cooke.

12 May 1837.

18113. What passed between you and Mr. Green?—To the best of my recollection, Mr. Green said, "Have you any objection to sign the petition."

18114. Did he come to you with the petition?—No, he came without one.

18115. Tell us what took place when he came to you?—I cannot recollect the words, the substance I can tell you; that it would be to my future benefit if I would sign the petition which he would draw up merely stating the truth; that he could obtain the truth from me by summoning me; and if I would state the truth voluntarily, it might be a benefit to other individuals.

18116. What individuals did he name?—He did not name any individuals.

18117. It would be a benefit to them?—Yes, and to myself.

18118. Anything else?—Nothing else worth repeating; we had a pot of what is called "Peacock."

18119. Did anything else pass upon the subject of the petition?—Nothing of any consequence.

18120. Let us hear what it was; we will judge of the consequence?—I do not recollect it.

18121. Did you upon that occasion agree to sign the petition?—Yes, I did.

18122. Containing the truth?—Yes, it is the truth.

18123. How soon after did he come to you again?—I have never seen him again till here.

18124. Where did you sign that petition?—In the writing-room the same afternoon.

18125. He was not present?—Indeed he was.

18126. I asked you whether you ever saw him after you agreed to sign?—No, I did not, because I had signed it at that time.

18127. Did he bring it prepared?—No.

18128. Where did he draw it up?—In the writing-room.

18129. Upon parchment?—I do not know what it was upon; I think it was upon paper.

18130. You signed it?—Yes.

18131. Did you ever sign any other petition?—Yes.

18132. Where did you sign it?—It was in Whitecross-street, to get released from my debts.

18133. Did you ever sign any other petition upon the subject of this inquiry?—I did not.

18134. Was it upon paper or parchment?—To the best of my recollection, it was upon paper.

18135. Was anybody present besides Mr. Green when you signed it?—There might have been a person in the writing-room; I am sure there was.

18136. Who was it?—I do not know.

18137. Was it a person that accompanied Green?—No, a prisoner.

18138. Was there any person in company with Mr. Green?—Not any one that I saw.

18139. I take for granted you did this without remuneration?—I did.

18140. And have received none since?—And have received none since.

18141. Recollect yourself?—I do.

18142. Do you mean to represent to the Committee you have had no money from anybody upon the subject of this inquiry?—Yes, I do.

18143. Have you received any money, or money's worth, for signing the petition?—I have not.

18144. Have you received any promise or engagement for money, or money's worth, for signing the petition?—No specific promise or engagement.

18145. State the promise you have received?—I have, and will state it again; that it would be for my benefit to sign the petition voluntarily; and if I did not, I could be brought up here to state it without.

18146. That was stated by Mr. Green?—Yes.

18147. Except that statement, you have had no other statement made to you, or any engagement or promise to give you money, or money's worth?—I have not; I do not mean to say I have not understood I should be benefited hereafter; but I have had no engagement.

18148. From whom have you understood you should be benefited hereafter?—Mr. George Jones did state to me, if I voluntarily gave my evidence, or did what was recommended to me, I should be paid for my attendances.

18149. Who is Mr. George Jones?—He has visited me in the prison.

18150. Who

18150. Who is he?—A stock-jobber.

18151. Is that all he said to you?—Yes.

18152. Have you had any promise or engagement from anybody else?—No.

18153. Of any kind, respecting this inquiry?—No.

18154. Have you seen anybody else in Whitecross-street upon the subject of this inquiry?—No; that I have seen individuals connected with the inquiry I admit, as I did Carr; but they have merely come to visit me as a prisoner, not being able to get out to them; but not upon the subject of this inquiry.

18155. Then am I to understand you distinctly to state that, from the time of the first application to you, up to the present period, you have received from no one any money connected with this inquiry?—Yes.

18156. Most distinctly you say so?—Yes.

18157. And particularly, do you represent to this Committee you have received no money, or promise of any money, for signing the petition?—Yes, I do; but I have been told, as I have told you before, that I expected benefit hereafter.

18158. Is the Committee to understand that you have had no promise of any money for signing the petition?—Yes, except what I have stated to you.

18159. Except that remuneration for your attendance, you have had no money; no promise of money; no money's worth or promise of money's worth, for anything you do?—I have had the promise from Mr. Green I have stated.

18160. For the loss of time?—It was not stated as loss of time or anything; the meaning of Mr. Green's words was this, if I gave my evidence voluntarily, or if I signed the petition voluntarily, that it would be a future benefit to me; and if I did not, I could be made hereafter to give the evidence; I might as well do it voluntarily, and I might probably receive some benefit.

18161. Then I am to understand, in conclusion, you have never received either money or money's worth from anybody, upon the subject matter of this inquiry?—Yes, you are.

18162. I find this passage in your petition, "That your petitioner never paid any deposit on the shares, although he appears on the deed to have so signed for 250;" do you mean the Committee to understand by that allegation, that you did not intend to represent that you had not paid any deposit at all?—Not for myself.

18163. Why did you not add those words?—Because the petition was drawn up in such a hurry, I did not observe the exact nature of it.

18164. If you had observed the exact nature of it, would you have altered it?—Yes.

18165. You would not have signed it if not altered; is that what you mean?—Yes.

18166. Why; because he did not state the truth?—Not exactly the correct state of the facts, altogether.

18167. Mr. *Forster.*] If it had been left to your own composition, you would have said you had not paid any deposit from funds of your own?—Yes; but the time was drawing to a close for strangers to leave the prison, and I had not had time to look over it carefully, which I should have had if Mr. Green had not had to go away immediately.

18168. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Did you ask for time to consider it, or for an adjournment?—I do not think I did; and I think Mr. Green said the petition should go in that night, or it was requisite to be had that day.

18169. Were the words in this allegation your words or Mr. Green's words?—They were written by Mr. Green.

18170. Did you dictate them, or did he write them of his own mere motion?—He wrote them himself.

18171. Did you tell Mr. Green, before he wrote this petition, the number of shares you had subscribed for?—I told him the amount.

18172. Did you tell him, as you have told us to day, 125 and 100?—Yes; I had the printed document. I knew the large amount was for Mr. Whitten, and the small one for Mr. Huckvale.

18173. Did you tell him one was 125 and the other 100?—Yes.

18174. Was that printed document like this [*handing a printed list to the Witness*]?—Something similar.

18175. I think you told my learned friend that you think you engaged your father to sign this deed upon one occasion?—I will not state I have not engaged him to sign it upon two occasions, but upon one I can.

 18176. Can

Henry Cooke.

12 May 1837.

18176. Can you tell the amount you engaged your father to sign for?—No; my book might probably tell that.

18177. But such as you yourself subscribed for, you separate entirely from those your father subscribed for?—Yes.

18178. Now the 125 and 100, when added, make 225 shares; will you be so good as to tell the Committee why you represented that your name appeared on the deed to have so signed for 250?—If there is an inaccuracy, it is probably in the printing, or something similar to that.

18179. Who produced the printed form to you?—It was Mr. Green; here it is; it is 225.

18180. Was the petition so hastily prepared, that in one part of it you allege you have signed the deed for 225 shares, and in another part of the same petition "your petitioner appears to have signed for 250?"—It is very possible I took the large and small amounts; the exact amount I could not tell.

18181. Did you know at that time how much you appeared on the deed for?—No, except from that printed paper.

18182. Did you come forward for the purpose of petitioning upon the representation made by Mr. Green, that you might be compelled if you were unwilling to do so, or did you come forward willingly to do so?—Most willingly, for I was very glad to leave the prison for two or three days holidays.

18183. That was the reason?—That was one reason; the other I have assigned.

18184. The same reason would have existed if you had answered the questions put to you by Mr. Leman?—I have stated that.

18185. Did you sign the petition on the belief you might be compelled to appear if you did not, or did you sign it as a person willing to come forward and give evidence?—As both.

18186. A mixture of willingness and unwillingness?—Yes.

18187. And the benefit of course?—Yes, undoubtedly.

18188. Do you know Mr. Stephens?—Yes.

18189. Have you seen him upon the subject?—No; the only time I have seen Mr. Stephens since I have been arrested has been yesterday and to-day.

18190. Was Mr. Stephens an acquaintance of yours before you had the misfortune to go to prison?—Yes.

18191. And Poulton and Green?—Yes.

18192. What do you call your business?—A stock-jobber; but I act also as a broker, when I can get any commissions.

18193. Are you a member of the Stock Exchange?—I was nominally a member; I was clerk to an individual who was a member, and I received no remuneration for my services.

18194. How does that make you a member?—I did business on my own account to any amount.

18195. Did you go into the Stock Exchange room?—There may be a little difficulty in getting back again, after taking the benefit of the Act; but I am not expelled.

18196. But you are a member, by reason of being the clerk of another member?—Yes.

18197. Who is that person?—Edward Stokes.

18198. Mr. *Forster.*] Edward Stokes, or John Edward Stokes?—His name is John Edward Stokes, but he is called Edward Stokes generally.

18199. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Had Mr. Stokes any other clerk but you?—No, he had a boy.

18200. Had he any clerk that went into the house but you?—No.

18201. *Chairman.*] How long were you his clerk?—Twelve months.

18202. Mr. *Clarkson.*] When did you leave him, if you have left him?—I was taken to Whitecross-street.

18203. Have you ever had any misunderstanding with him?—No serious misunderstanding.

18204. He did not charge you with making a contract in his name without his authority, and having ruined him by a speculation which has failed?—It is true I had entered into a speculation; but I never knew him to charge me with that.

18205. Had you his authority to do it?—I had authority to do what I liked on my own account.

18206. Had you any authority to do anything on his account?—If I had instructions from him.

18207. Have

18207. Have you seen Mr. Stokes in the room to-day?—Not in this room; I saw him in the adjoining room.

18208. You say you had authority to transact any speculations in your own name; have you transacted speculations in his name without his authority?—You are wrong in stating that I said, I transacted speculations in my own name; it was as clerk to him, as nominal clerk, and the bargains were done in his name.

18209. Have you transacted any speculations on the part of Mr. Stokes, whom you say you were clerk to, without his authority?—No, none whatever; I do not mean to say he knew all my transactions; but he gave me full authority to do it.

18210. Though his authority was not particular, there was a general authority to transact business in his name?—Yes.

18211. If he has stated before this Committee, that you or a clerk of his, when there was only a boy besides you in his office, entered into a speculation without his authority, and ruined him, it is not true?—It is true I have entered into this speculation.

18212. What is it?—Bought some Spanish bonds.

18213. To what amount?—To the amount of 7,000 *l.*

18214. When was it?—Not long before I was arrested.

18215. How long before?—About a week before.

18216. Of whom did you buy them?—Of several individuals; I can name them, Knight, Waller and Woolley.

18217. And others?—Not many others; there could be but one more, I believe.

18218. Is this the gentleman you refer to; is that Mr. Stokes [*pointing to Mr. Stokes*]?—It is.

18219. That is the person you refer to, for whom you bought the Spanish bonds?—I did not buy them for him.

18220. For whom?—For myself.

18221. With his knowledge?—I do not think he knew it.

18222. Do you not know he did not know it?—He might know I had them; he did not know whether they were for myself or some of my principals.

18223. Am I to understand, once for all, that this speculation in Spanish bonds was a speculation into which you entered on your own account, or Mr. Stokes's?—Distinctly on my own account.

18224. In Mr. Stokes's name?—Decidedly, it must have been in his name, because I was authorized to do business for him; and the transactions were or ought to have been entered in his name.

18225. You were authorized to transact business on your own account, but in Mr. Stokes's name, to any extent you chose?—Yes.

18226. Did you buy those bonds in Mr. Stokes's name?—I mentioned no name when I bought them; my own credit was good enough at that time.

18227. As Mr. Stokes's clerk, or as an individual?—Either as an individual or Mr. Stokes's clerk.

18228. You were known to the parties?—Yes, they said they had the bonds to sell, and I bought them for a time speculation, as it is called.

18229. What was the amount?—£.7,000, but in reality not more than 1,400 *l.*; being about twenty, the difference is not above 170 *l.* or 180 *l.*, which I should have been able to make up from my friends, if I had not been arrested and deprived of my credit.

18230. When you were arrested, were you in solvent circumstances?—No.

18231. A week before you were arrested were you in solvent circumstances?—No.

18232. When you bought those bonds, were you in solvent circumstances?—If I was called upon to pay my debts immediately, I could not pay them; but I was paying the interest upon them.

18233. I am asking you whether you were able to pay 20 *s.* in the pound?—If called upon to pay all my debts, I could not pay them; I borrowed 450 *l.*

18234. What were your debts at the time?—Would you like to have the amount of the annuity I granted?

18235. I should like to have the amount of your liabilities the week before you went to prison?—Do you mean including these deeds?

18236. No.—Probably about 1,200 *l.*; some of them were for acceptances, which I had no reason to doubt of being paid.

18237. What were your assets the week before?—I had a profit one day of one hundred and odd pounds, which run out during the same day; 150 *l.* there was,

Henry Cooke.

12 May 1837.

which was lost the same day. It is impossible to say upon stock-jobbers' transactions. I was without a guinea one moment, and the next hour or two hours afterwards I might have realized 100 *l.* or 150 *l.*

18238. Is Mr. Stokes made liable for these things you did on your own account?—I do not think any man is liable, because they are time transactions.

18239. Do you not know that Mr. Stokes has been held in the Stock Exchange liable, and that it has been the cause of his ruin?—I do not believe that he is liable, upon the ground that they are not legal debts, and cannot be recovered.

18240. Is there any other ground upon which you say he is not liable?—No.

18241. You entered into the speculation by virtue of a general authority from Mr. Stokes, to deal in your own name; it was in consequence of that you entered into the engagement about these Spanish bonds?—Yes.

18242. And it was by that general authority you acted?—Yes.

Re-examined by Mr. *Rowe.*

18243. You have stated, that at the time you made the purchase of these Spanish bonds your liabilities were 1,200*l.*, or thereabouts?—No; I do not mean that they were as much as that, till after the purchase.

18244. At the time of the arrest?—Yes.

18245. When were you arrested?—The 1st of April.

18246. I understand you to represent that your assets, though they might have fluctuated, were never more than 100 *l.* above, or many hundreds below?—£. 450 of that 1,200 *l.* I had given security for; four years ago my own debts were not above 200 *l.* or 250 *l.*; the others were only liabilities, which I had no reason to believe I should be called upon to pay.

18247. I find your name in this list for about 16,875 *l.* In the Deptford and Dover I find your name for 11,500 *l.*; at the time you signed this deed for that amount, were your assets, at any rate, under 1,200 *l.*?—Decidedly they were.

18248. With regard to what took place in Whitecross-street, am I right in supposing, at the time Mr. Leman saw you, no mention was made of a petition?—You are quite right.

18249. Am I quite right in supposing he offered you no inducement of a pecuniary nature, not even a pot of Peacock, which you speak of?—Not even that.

18250. I also understood that you refused to give information?—Yes.

18251. You were going to say you have received instructions from your solicitor; was your object, in refusing to give information, that you might not compromise yourself?—Yes.

18252. Was that the object of it?—My solicitor advised me not to write or say anything upon the subject.

18253. Were the only persons you communicated with, about its being better for you, George Jones and Green?—Mr. Green was the only person I spoke to on the subject of the petition.

18254. Who is George Jones; do you know him?—Yes.

18255. Has he anything to do with Messrs. Vizard and Leman?—I do not know who he has to do with.

18256. Is he a solicitor's clerk?—No; a stock-jobber.

18257. Have you known him long?—Yes, many years.

18258. Did you know who he came from?—No; he did not come specially on business; he came to see me.

18259. And he advised you to tell, because the Committee would oblige you?—Yes.

18260. It has been said that you stated in your petition, in one part, you had signed for 225 shares; is that true?—Yes.

18261. Is the paragraph in the petition stating you signed for 250 shares the one you looked over very cursorily?—Yes; and also that I paid no money for myself.

18262. It is there that the misrepresentation with regard to the amount of shares takes place?—Yes.

18263. Now, with regard to your father, his name is William Cooke?—William Joshua Cooke; he usually signs his name William Cooke.

18264. Is Keppel-row, Stoke Newington, his residence?—Yes.

18265. He has signed in the first instance for eighty-two shares?—Yes.

18266. "William Cooke, 100 shares;" was that signature at your request?—I cannot recollect whether it was the amount of those shares, but that I did employ him upon those occasions to sign, I can state.

18267. Was

Henry Cooke.

12 May 1837.

18267. Was it upon two occasions?—I think it very probable it was upon two.

18268. At the time your father was so employed by you to sign the deed, was not he in distressed circumstances?—He was a man without much money; he was poor, but I can hardly state him as being in distressed circumstances, because I had money that was at his service.

18269. Was he good for 7,500 *l.*?—Certainly not.

18270. Was he good altogether for 13,000 *l.*?—He was not good for 100 *l.*, I should say.

18271. Who were the *bonâ fide* holders of those shares you put into your father's hands?—That I cannot tell; my book, which is in the Insolvent Court, may perhaps enlighten me a little upon the point, and I may be able to tell you.

18272. Can you recollect whether you ever handed over to your father any shares that had been given to you by Mr. Huckvale?—No; I might ascertain it from my book only, for this reason, that a great number of the shares that were so signed and delivered to those parties I employed to get them signed, are shares I had bought and sold myself; but without the book I cannot tell you.

18273. At the time you handed over those shares, did you pay your father a consideration on signing?—I did not give him any consideration; I occasionally lent him money, and gave him money, and did all his transactions in shares without charging him anything, but I gave no remuneration for this.

18274. Were you paid any commission for signing the deed in this instance through your father?—Yes; if I signed them for other persons, I was.

18275. If they were in point of fact shares connected with a transaction similar to that we have been inquiring into this morning, you would have been paid a commission?—Yes, no doubt; I do not mean to say I have not signed or procured individuals to sign for the accommodation of others; but the other times, most probably, I received a consideration for it.

18276. Does not that, put in Stock Exchange language, mean that a certain premium was paid to the jobber for completing the transaction?—It is what we call a turn of the market; if I had some shares, and the selling price was one-eighth to a one-fourth, and the individuals wanted the shares signed, you would say, I will give you one-eighth if you will get the shares signed for me.

18277. Mr. *Clarkson.*] When the fluctuation was from one-eighth to a one-fourth?—Yes.

18278. Mr. *Rowe.*] Can you tell me, without reference to that book, whether the shares your father signed for were your own shares, or shares put into your hands by other people?—I distinctly say that I cannot.

18279. Did you, at the time you gave those shares to your father to sign for you, give him the means of paying the deposit?—Yes, I may safely state I did, for he had not the means of paying them himself, provided it was necessary to have the means, because some time ago, when I gave him those shares, it was only necessary to sign the deed, without paying the instalment; the instalment had not been paid then.

18280. Were you ever at this office in the Poultry, and allowed to sign the deed without paying the deposit?—No.

[The Witness withdrew.

William Joshua Cooke, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

W. J. Cooke.

18281. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the person whose name appears on Rennie's subscription deed in this way, "William Cooke, 7, Keppel-row, Stoke Newington, gentleman, 100 shares, 7,500 *l.*"?—Yes.

18282. I find another entry of this kind, "William Cooke, Keppel-row, Stoke Newington, gentleman, 82 shares, 6,150 *l.*",?—Yes.

18283. Did you sign the deed for these shares on both occasions?—I did.

18284. Were the shares for which you signed your own property?—No.

18285. Did you sign for your son, Henry Cooke?—Yes.

18286. At that time were you good for those sums, or anything like it?—No.

18287. Where did you sign this deed?—One of them was at Messrs. Hankey's, in Fenchurch-street; the other was at Chapel-place, in the Poultry.

18288. The first was at the bankers'?—Yes.

18289. And the second in Chapel-place?—Yes.

18290. When you signed in Chapel-place, did you go into more than one room, do you recollect?—No, not to sign the deed; I did not.

18291. Did you produce a white scrip, like this?—Yes.

W. J. Cooke.

12 May 1837.

18292. Your son put them into your hand?—Yes.

18293. Did you pay a deposit upon them?—Yes, 1 *l.* upon each.

18294. And had your son provided you with money for that purpose?—Yes.

18295. Upon signing the deed in the Poultry, when you produced this and signed the deed, did you then receive blue scrip of this description, [*exhibiting it*]?—Yes.

18296. Was the whole of that transaction, giving the white scrip and signing the deed, and receiving the blue, all done in one room?—Yes.

18297. *Chairman.*] Did you go into more than one room?—No, except into the clerk's office, to inquire for the secretary.

18298. Mr. *Rowe.*] And upon that you were shown into the other room?—Yes.

18299. There you met with a gentleman; do you know his name?—Mr. Dean.

18300. And the business was transacted with him?—Yes.

18301. Do you recollect whether any inquiry was made as to who you were, or what passed?—I do not recollect, there might or might not.

18302. The blue scrip you handed over to your son?—I did.

18303. *Chairman.*] There was no impediment made to the transfer, no difficulty about it?—No, not any.

18304. Mr. *Rowe.*] It was done at once, as a matter of course?—Yes.

18305. Do you recollect what time this transaction was; was it in this year?—No; I think it was in the last year.

18306. Before Christmas?—Yes, some time before Christmas.

18307. I am speaking of your appearance at Chapel-place, Poultry?—Yes.

18308. You think it was last year?—Yes.

18309. About that time had you signed other deeds for your son?—Yes, I had signed several, which I have already enumerated here.

18310. Is it true you signed the City and Richmond Railway?—Yes, I did.

18311. Did you sign the South Midland?—Yes.

18312. And the London, Shoreham and Brighton?—I do not know that I have, I may or may not. By the London and Shoreham, you do not mean Sir John Rennie's Brighton?

18313. No?—Then I do not know that I have.

18314. I see you are a petitioner here; will you have the kindness to tell me who prepared the petition, which desires that the Bill may not be prejudiced; when did you sign it?—About a week or ten days ago.

18315. Did you draw it up yourself?—No, it was drawn up at the office for Rennie's Brighton.

18316. Who came to you upon the subject?—Mr. Jones.

18317. Is that Mr. George Jones?—Yes.

18318. A stock-jobber?—Yes.

18319. Do you know whether Mr. Jones ever visited your son in Whitecross-street Prison; did you hear that from Mr. Jones?—Very likely he has.

18320. Is Mr. George Jones a stock-jobber?—Yes.

18321. Did he come to you upon the subject of this petition?—Yes, he said I should get out of the torment and trouble by sending in a petition, and get rid of them altogether.

18322. Did Mr. Jones offer to draw the petition for you?—No.

18323. What did he do?—He took me to the office of Rennie's Brighton, in Bridge-street.

18324. Did Mr. Jones tell you it would be a pecuniary benefit to you?—He said that they would behave like gentlemen to me; he saw I had been buffeted about a good deal; I do not know whether he meant to serve me as the others had.

18325. Had you never any conversation with anybody else about the petition?—No.

18326. Have you ever told any one that your son paid you for signing these deeds?—No; it is not likely I should tell anybody that, because it did not occur.

18327. *Chairman.*] He did not pay you?—No.

18328. Mr. *Rowe.*] You mean to say it did not occur; he did not pay you specifically for that job?—No.

18329. He supplied you with money from time to time?—No; he has transacted business for me on the Stock Exchange.

18330. And

18330. And accommodated you from time to time as you wanted it?—He has done business for me.

18331. That is one thing; it is another thing to be accommodated with pecuniary loans: do you mean to say he has not accommodated you with loans?—No; I have accommodated him through life; I do not know that there has been anything the other way.

18332. But Mr. George Jones introduced you to Rennie's office?—Yes.

18333. Did you see who drew up the petition?—Yes, I saw it done.

18334. Who is the gentleman?—I do not know; I have not seen him since or before.

18335. It was signed there, was it?—Yes.

18336. You spoke about behaving like gentlemen; do you not expect some pecuniary compensation?—"Blessed is he that expecteth nothing."

18337. I am not in a condition to know whether you are that blessed man?—I did expect to get something from the South Midland; but they said, I was not a gentleman, and I got nothing.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

18338. You say that you signed this deed in one room, and you afterwards said that the whole transaction took place in one room; do you mean that the signature to the deed, the exchange of scrip, and the payment of money, all took place in one room, or did you sign the deed in one, and exchange the scrip in another?—No, it was done in the same room; I handed over the scrip to Mr. Dean at one end of the table, and I went to the other to sign the deed, to the best of my recollection.

18339. Is your recollection accurate about it, or may you be mistaken?—I have no doubt it was the case.

18340. Was there any other gentleman in the room besides the gentleman you call Mr. Dean?—Yes; I think there was a gentleman came in, but he did not remain long.

18341. Was there any other gentleman with whom you transacted any part of the business you have spoke of, the signature to the deeds, or the exchanging the scrip, but Mr. Dean?—Yes, there was a tall young gentleman.

18342. What did you do with him?—He took me to the other end of the table to sign the deed.

18343. I suppose he witnessed the deed?—Yes, he did.

18344. And you feel sure this was all done in the same room?—Yes.

18345. I do not know whether you have done it; do you recollect whether you have signed any subscription deeds of companies that have since obtained Acts of Parliament?—Yes, I believe I have.

18346. Can you tell us the company?—I do not know that that is requisite.

18347. *Chairman.*] If you recollect?—I signed the North Midland, and they have obtained their Act.

18348. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Any other?—I believe I signed the Greenwich.

18349. Any other?—I cannot recollect.

18350. Is your memory so frail upon the subject?—I may have signed others.

18351. Your memory is not perfect upon these transactions?—It is some time back; I did not set down these things; it is a ready money business; if you sign the deed, you sell the shares; at least that has been my case.

18352. You have been a holder of shares of your own?—Yes.

18353. To what extent have you been a holder of your own shares?—I cannot say.

18354. I do not want to know to fifty; can you tell us within a hundred?—Not more than twenty at a time of railway shares, if you mean that. As to other things, I have got hundreds of them now.

18355. About how many, upon the whole, may you have been a holder of in railway shares?—Not more than twenty or thirty at a time.

18356. How many altogether?—I cannot tell; it is quite impossible.

18357. How long have you been at it?—These fifteen years.

18358. That is almost before railways began?—Twelve or fourteen years.

18359. You cannot give us any idea of the number?—No.

18360. Or the proportion of companies you have signed deeds for that have since obtained their Acts?—No, I cannot.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *J. Whittan.*

12 May 1837.

Mr. *James Whittan,* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

18361. Mr. *Rowe.*] YOU are a member of the Stock Exchange?—I am.

18362. Have you been long a member of that body?—I have been a member of it two years, and connected with it twenty, as near as may be.

13863. What have you been engaged in principally?—As a jobber.

18364. Have you dealt extensively in railway shares?—I have dealt occasionally in them.

18365. In the shares of various railways?—Yes; in a vast number.

18366. Perhaps you will allow me to ask where your petition was drawn up; was it drawn up by yourself?—There was a petition that I signed, I recollect very well. Perhaps you will have the kindness to read it; and I shall be able to tell whether it is mine.

[*The first part of the petition was read.*]

18367. *Chairman.*] Did you sign a petition beginning in that way?—Yes.

18368. Mr. *Rowe.*] Did you draw it up yourself?—No.

18369. Where did you sign it?—I was brought from the Stock Exchange to Sweet and Sutton's office, a place I had never been at before, and I signed somewhere in this neighbourhood.

18370. At the office of Rennie's railway?—Yes.

18371. Was it drawn up at the time you went there?—Yes; it was prepared at the time, and read over to me for my approval.

18372. Did you see Mr. Sutton?—Yes; I saw him on the stairs; I did not see him in the room.

18373. What Mr. Sutton was that?—Mr. Robert Sutton.

18374. Was either of the solicitors to the company there, or their clerk?—There was a Mr. Dean there; they told me his name was Dean.

18375. He was the secretary to the company?—I do not know what he was.

18376. Do you know a person named Henry Cooke?—Yes; I know him very well.

18377. Did you employ Henry Cooke?—Yes, certainly; frequently.

18378. Did you employ him for the purpose of signing railway deeds?—Not for that purpose only; I employed him to obtain me new shares for old, which I had, and paid him for so doing; whether he signed, I do not know.

18379. At the time you gave him the old shares, were not you aware that the only mode of doing that was by signing the deed?—Yes; and I was unwilling to incur the responsibility myself; I understood there was a responsibility attached to it.

18380. At the time you employed Henry Cooke to get new shares for old ones, were you a considerable holder of Rennie's Brighton shares?—I cannot state that; because some days I had a great many, and others very few.

18381. Do you recollect when it was?—No.

18382. Do you recollect the month?—No; nor within three months.

18383. Cannot you recollect whether it was in the last year or the present?—I should say it was this year, certainly; it was just previous to the issue of the new shares.

18384. Have you not said in that petition, that in the month of January you were a large holder of Rennie's Brighton shares?—It is very likely I was in November and December and January.

18385. Were not you in January?—I cannot say that I was.

18386. If you said so at the time you signed the petition, have you any doubt you were the holder of shares?—There is no doubt of it; and that ever since Rennie's shares have been out I have been a holder of them every day.

18387. Have you any doubt, after having put your signature to the petition, that it was "in or about the month of January that your petitioners were holders of a large number of shares in that company;" have you any doubt of it?—I have no doubt of it, not the slightest.

18388. Now I ask you, do you believe it was in the month of January you employed Cooke?—It is very likely it was, I cannot tell that it was so or not; if you can tell me when the new shares were issued, I can tell you whether it was in that month I employed him or not.

18389. If I was to give you the day when the old scrip was to be received, was

was it before that day?—Certainly, it was before that day; it was certainly before that day, because I sent the shares in to get the new ones.

18390. Do you remember the number of shares you put into this man's hands?—No I do not, he states it was 125, and I suppose it was so.

18391. You will take that as the number?—Yes; if that was the fact, I do not know to the contrary.

18392. Did you pay him for so doing?—I paid him, certainly.

18393. What did you pay him?—I paid him a pound, the deposit, and a premium for getting the new shares; I thought I had as much right to do it as any one else.

18394. You have said, in your petition, you did not know you were doing wrong?—No, or I should not have put myself to the trouble of being brought up here.

18395. You did not think you did anything wrong in putting up a man of straw to incur a responsibility which would have fallen upon you if you had signed it?—I did not care whether he incurred responsibility or not.

18396. Do you mean to say you did not know you were doing wrong in putting up a man of straw to sign for these large sums?—I mean to say, I did not know I was doing wrong in getting new shares for old ones.

18397. Is it true or not, that you knew these shares could only be got by signing the deed?—I did.

18398. At the time you employed Cooke, were you aware that Cooke was a man not in solvent circumstances?—I certainly thought that he was solvent, and ran the risk of losing my money by putting it in his hands.

18399. Did you believe that Cooke was a man good for the amount of shares you intrusted to him?—I should not have trusted him to that amount.

18400. Do you think he was good for anything like that amount?—I should think not.

18401. *Chairman.*] Would you have trusted him for a week with 125 *l.*?—No.

18402. Would you have trusted him with it for two or three days?—No, I should not have liked to have trusted him with it for a night, but I have trusted him to get rid of a responsibility; I ran that risk, but I have always known him an honest man.

18403. Mr. *Rowe.*] Did you think you were doing right in letting him sign for 9,375 *l.*, a man you would not trust for one night with 200 *l.*?—It did not occur to me at all; I was quite careless whether he signed or anybody else signed, as long as I got my shares.

18404. Have you employed Mr. Cooke to procure others to sign deeds for you in any other instance?—Not that I recollect.

18405. Have you employed any other parties to sign for you?—Not directly.

18406. Have you employed any one besides Cooke to sign Rennie's Brighton?—Not directly; indirectly I was connected with Sam Carr, who signed for a good many, if I can believe the statement that is printed.

18407. Are you aware that Sam Carr, as you call him, has signed Rennie's Brighton for 107,000 *l.*?—So it states, some one stated it in that paper, I do not know that it is so.

18408. In your petition, you are joined with Mr. Huckvale, and Mr. Frith; were your joint holders of those shares?—Yes, we were joint holders in those shares.

18409. Interested as partners in them?—We were interested in them, not as partners; we were jobbing in shares in the market, though not acknowledged as such in the house.

18410. In January, were those shares *bonâ fide* your own property?—Yes, they were; and paid for.

18411. Could you give me any idea of the amount of Rennie's Brighton you held in January?—No; it varied every day.

18412. Have you any means of ascertaining the amount?—No.

18413. Do you not keep a jobber's book?—Yes; I generally destroy it; it lasts about a month, and I destroy and wipe my razors on it. It is gone since that time.

18414. Do you wipe your razors on your cash-book?—It would be a very stupid thing.

18415. Then you have it?—Yes.

18416. Will

Mr. *J. Whitian.*

12 May 1837.

18416. Will that give you any information of the sums you paid for Rennie's Brighton shares?—No.

18417. You have no means of ascertaining the names of the parties from whom you bought Rennie's Brighton?—Not so far back as January.

18418. What you call your jobber's book has been destroyed?—Yes; I destroy them regularly.

18419. Have you any book that gives you any information upon the subject?—I have a little book in my pocket, which will explain pretty nearly the nature of my work. I suppose it is necessary I should refer to it. Every day, after my work, I take out my profit or loss upon the day; that is added up, and divided into certain sums: here is the profit upon Rennie's shares.

18420. You have stated in your petition you held a large number of Rennie's Brighton; I want to know if you can give me the names of any of those parties from whom you procured the shares, by a reference to any document?—No, I cannot.

18421. You gave white scrip to Henry Cooke?—Yes.

18422. Can you give me the names of the parties to whom the blue scrip was assigned?—No; they were sold in fives, tens, and fifties, till they were got rid of; and the parties who paid me did not pay me for Rennie's shares alone; they had half a dozen others included in it.

18423. Were you ever at Rennie's office in the Poultry?—No; I do not know where it is.

18424. Were you at Mr. Sutton's office, the stock-broker?—Yes, every week, I should say, at least; I have had very many transactions with them.

18425. Have you any doubt you were carrying on transactions with Sutton's house in the month of January in this year?—I should think I had some transactions with them; but I might just as well attempt to recollect all the bargains I do upon the Stock Exchange, as to recollect all the bargains with Sutton's house.

18426. You say you were a jobber, and dealt in railway shares; had you not transactions in railway shares with Sutton's house?—I do not know I have had transactions with them; I do not recollect any particular time.

18427. The early part of the year?—I cannot tell. If you knew the different business done at the Stock Exchange any one day, you would know it was impossible to recollect any one particular case.

18428. I do not want to know the particular case; but, you being in a large way of business, and transacting business with Sutton's house, have you any doubt that you were dealing with Sutton's house in the beginning of this year?—No, I cannot say if I was; I did not; I should be saying what I do not know.

18429. Will you undertake to say you had not, in the early part of this year, transactions with Sutton's house in Rennie's Brighton?—I cannot recollect any particular time I had dealings with them.

18430. Will you undertake to say you had not transactions in the early part of the year, in January, with Sutton's house, in Rennie's Brighton shares?—I will not undertake to say; I do not recollect.

18431. Have you any book or document by referring to which you could tell the nature of your transactions with Sutton's house in January?—None at all. I cannot tell day after day; I take off the profit or loss upon the day's transactions.

18432. Could not you, by a reference to your cash-book, tell me the nature of your transactions with Sutton's house in January?—No, I cannot tell you how many shares I have got in my cash-book.

18433. Tell me the way in which you keep your cash-book?—It is a check against my bankers, with the receipts and payments.

18434. Do you not enter the names of the parties from whom you receive money?—Yes.

18435. Do you not enter the names of the parties to whom you pay money?—Yes; the same as a cash-book is kept.

18436. Will not that enable you to say whether you had or not transactions with Sutton's house at that time?—Yes, no doubt it will. You asked me about Rennie's Brighton; I am speaking of transactions generally.

18437. If, referring to that book, you can tell you were transacting business with

Mr. *J. Whittan.*

12 May 1837.

with Sutton's house, could not you tell whether it was in mining shares, or railway shares, or Columbian bonds?—No; it might be a balance check I received. I cannot tell.

18438. You do not make an entry of the subject matter of the transaction?—No.

The witness was directed to attend on Friday next at eleven o'clock, with any book or paper connected with those transactions with Sutton's house in the month of January 1837.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Edward Frith,* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *E. Frith.*

18439. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you also on the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

18440. How long have you been there?—Two or three years.

18441. Are you a jobber on the Exchange?—Yes.

18442. You are a party presenting this petition, signed by Mr. Huckvale, Mr. Whittan, and yourself?—Yes.

18443. Do you recollect where you signed the petition; was it at the railway office?—Yes; the one at Westminster, in Bridge-street.

18444. *Chairman.*] At whose instance did you sign it?—No person induced me.

18445. Mr. *Rowe.*] Who asked you?—No person asked me directly.

18446. What led you to sign it?—I understood from Mr. Sutton, in consequence of some transactions done by us, certain mischief was likely to take place to Rennie's company. Now I knew they were perfectly free from any thing that had been done by me, and I felt inclined to state that, and said, I would state, as far as I knew, everything I had had to do with the matter; that I had no objection to any of my transactions in the business being known; he said, that was all they wanted.

18447. Was this conversation with Mr. Robert Sutton?—Yes.

18448. Did you say that you knew that they were perfectly free?—Yes, as far as anybody can know.

18449. Now we will analyze your means of knowledge. You were a large holder of Rennie's scrip in the month of January last?—I do not remember the month.

18450. You state so here?—Then it is so.

18451. Were you jointly concerned with Mr. Huckvale and Mr. Whittan in that scrip?—Yes.

18452. Do you know a person named Samuel Carr?—Yes.

18453. Do you know he signed the deed for 107,000*l.*?—I do not know the amount; I have heard it is something like that.

18454. Do you know that Samuel Carr is a man in indigent circumstances?—Yes.

18455. How long have you known him?—About ten years.

18456. About the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

18457. Did you not know, in procuring new shares for old, Mr. Huckvale and Mr. Whitton were in the habit of employing persons to transact that business?—Yes.

18458. Did you not know that the deed must be signed for that purpose?—Yes.

18459. Did you not know that men of straw were put forward for that purpose?—Yes.

18460. Carr, for instance?—Yes.

18461. Were you ever at the railway office in the Poultry?—No.

18462. Not having been there, and not knowing the mode in which the business was transacted there, how can you say they were free from it?—I say, as far as I know.

18463. Yes; your knowledge comes to nothing; were you ever there?—No.

18464. How can you say that the transactions that took place there did or did not criminate any of the directors?—No party belonging to the company knew of the transactions I was engaged in.

18465. How do you know that?—I cannot positively assert it; I have as great a reason for thinking so as any indifferent person.

18466. You have signed your name to a paper, stating that you exceedingly regret it, and you were not aware you were doing wrong in putting forward men of straw; and you most distinctly declare, that the directors of the said company,

Mr. *E. Frith.*

12 May 1837.

or their officers, or their agents, or any of them, in no way participated therein. Now be so good as to give the Committee your means of knowledge that enabled you to make that distinct declaration?—It might be so, as far as I know.

18467. Look at that; is that your petition?—I can take your word for the proper reading of it.

18468. Then as far as relates to any of the company not being aware of it, give the Committee the grounds for your determination?—Because I have never had any communication with them about the matter, and how should they know.

18469. Did you know you were employing agents to sign this deed?—Yes.

18470. Did you know that men notoriously not worth a shilling were employed for those purposes?—Yes.

18471. With all that means of knowledge, do you think it does you credit to put this upon paper?—Yes; am I to answer facts from the knowledge which I have, or am I here to defend myself from having done right or wrong; I am inclined to do the one or the other.

18472. *Chairman.*] The last question is whether, after the admissions you have made, you think that your conduct in that respect does you credit?—I certainly thought I was perfectly justified in the matter, or I should not have done it, upon the ground that I had a right to sell, or give away, or burn my property; nobody could have disputed my right to sell these shares to any person. Suppose I had sold them, no man can dispute my right to buy the result of those shares when they came in a new shape into the market. I am not bound to look after the interests of joint-stock companies; whether the men subscribing the deeds were able to fulfil their engagements, was no concern of mine, or I could neither buy or sell a share; if it was, how could I sell a share with any justice, without being perfectly sure that the persons were men of property.

18473. Do you think you had a right to traffic with other persons' property, and put forward persons of no responsibility, and shirk your own responsibility?—I think I had a right to do what I liked with my property.

Mr. *Rowe.*] Then I shall ask you nothing further.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

18474. You have been asked a good many questions as to your means of knowledge, and some of them very angrily; is one of the means by which you have been enabled to state that the company, its officers and agents, had nothing to do with this transaction, that you yourself never had any communication with them upon the subject?—I never had any further communication with them upon the subject, than I stated the fact of the petition.

18475. From the time when you and your coadjutors rightly or wrongly speculated in these shares, and employed Messrs. Carr and Poulton, and such persons, to procure the exchange of scrip, up to this period have you any reason to know or believe that the company, its agents or officers, were in the slightest degree cognizant of your transactions?—Certainly not.

18476. *Chairman.*] Have you any grounds for knowing whether the directors, officers or agents of the company, were cognizant of these your proceedings with Carr or Poulton, or not?—No, I have no means of knowing.

18477. Mr. *Rowe.*] Have you known Mr. Robert Sutton for some years?—Yes.

18478. Have you ever had any conversation with him about Rennie's Brighton?—Many.

18479. In January?—Ever since it has been a company.

18480. Were you in the habit of jobbing for that house?—We are not in the habit of jobbing for any house; we are in the habit of standing in the market and selling to any one.

18481. Did you job for Sutton's house?—Certainly I did not job for Sutton's house; your question is not correct.

18482. *Chairman.*] Do you job with them?—Yes, make them prices and deal with them.

18483. Mr. *Rowe.*] You do not act as their agent?—No.

18484. Had you any dealings with them in January?—Most likely, but I could not tell without looking at my book.

18485. By

Mr. *E. Frith.*

12 May 1837.

18485. By looking at your book, can you tell?—Yes.
18486. *Chairman.*] You keep a jobbing-book?—Yes.
18487. You preserved it for that month?—Yes, I have not got it with me.

[The Witness withdrew.

Henry Frederick Warner, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

H. F. Warner.

18488. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the party whose name appears on Rennie's subscription list to this effect: "Warner, Henry Frederick, 39, Lothbury, gentleman, 50 shares, 3,750 *l.*"?—Yes.
18489. What is your age at present?—Sixteen.
18490. When were you sixteen?—The 6th of this month.
18491. When did you sign for those shares?—I do not recollect.
18492. Was it this year or the last?—This year.
18493. Are you a clerk with Mr. Williams, a stockbroker, at 39, Lothbury?—Yes.
18494. Were you so at the time you signed for those shares?—Yes.
18495. Where did you sign?—At Chapel-court, Poultry.
18496. When you went to sign, did you present white scrip of that kind?—No, nothing.
18497. Just tell us what took place; did you present any written paper of any kind?—No, Mr. Williams went with me.
18498. Did any one produce scrip of this kind in your presence?—Not that I am aware of; I saw none.
18499. Were you in more than one room?—Only one room.
18500. What took place?—I signed those shares for Mr. Williams.
18501. What other gentleman was present?—Several clerks were present.
18502. Do you know the secretary of the company?—Yes.
18503. Was he present?—No, he was not.
18504. What is his name?—Dean.
18505. He was not present?—No.
18506. Did Mr. Williams produce any papers of any kind?—I did not see any.
18507. Did you pay any money?—Not myself.
18508. Did any one pay any money in your presence?—Not that I am aware of.
18509. What was said by Mr. Williams?—That I was to sign my name for those shares on his account, that they were his shares.
18510. He said they were his shares?—Yes.
18511. Did he say that to the parties that were there?—Yes.
18512. Was any remark made upon that, that it was improper, and he must sign for his own shares?—No.
18513. Upon that you signed?—Yes.
18514. At what hour of the day was this?—I do not recollect.
18515. About what time?—About half-past three.
18516. Mr. *Lushington.*] Are you sure that those clerks heard those observations of Mr. Williams?—Yes; Mr. Williams had previously bought 53 shares, and buying 50 more, he did not know he was allowed to sign the deed twice, and he got me to do it, and those shares he has.
18517. Have you heard that from Mr. Williams?—No, that I know myself.
18518. How do you know it?—From Mr. Williams.
18519. Did he say anything upon the subject to the clerks?—No.
18520. Nothing, but they were his shares?—Yes.
18521. You are sure he said that?—Yes.
18522. And that they heard it?—Yes.
18523. *Chairman.*] When did Mr. Williams tell you that was his reason for getting you to sign it?—Not at the time I signed it.
18524. How long ago was it?—It was one day this week.
18525. When did he tell you that the reason for your signing, and his not signing, was, that he had signed the deed once already?—To-day.
18526. Mr. *Rowe.*] He did not tell you so at the time?—No.
18527. Have you ever seen any of the Sutton's firm at Mr. Williams's house?—No, I have not.
18528. Do you know whether there were dealings between them and Mr. Williams?—I do not know.

H. F. Warner.

12 May 1837.

18529. At the time that Mr. Williams went with you to this place, and directed you to sign for him, did he give you any reason for it?—No.

18530. He said that the shares were his shares?—Yes.

18531. Did you see him take away the blue scrip with him?—No.

18532. *Chairman.*] Do you know the names of any of the clerks in the office?—No.

18533. Turn round and say if you can see any of the clerks that were there now present?—[*The Witness looked round.*]

Mr. *Jackson*: I witnessed the signature.

18534. Mr. *Rowe.*] Do you recollect whether anybody signed the deed with you?—That gentleman did [*pointing to Mr. Jackson*].

18535. Do you know the name of any one else that was there?—No.

18536. Had you known him before?—I do not think I had.

18537. How many were there?—Two or three.

The cross-examination was postponed.

[The Witness withdrew.

James Stride, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

James Stride.

18538. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the party whose name appears upon Rennie's deed to this effect: "James Stride, 124, Wood-street, merchant, forty-five shares, 3375 *l.*"?—Yes.

18539. Witnessed by Henry Dean. Be so good as to tell me your age?—Nineteen last February.

18540. What are you?—A clerk in Messrs. Wilsons' counting-house.

18541. Who are Messrs. Wilsons?—Merchants.

18542. Where?—Wood-street.

18543. You are a clerk there?—Yes.

18544. You have no interest there?—None whatever.

18545. You are described as a merchant; that is not the fact?—No.

18546. Did you put it down upon the suggestion of any one, or at your own?—At the suggestion of one of my masters.

18547. *Chairman.*] Which of your masters?—Lea Wilson.

18548. Mr. *Rowe.*] Can you recollect when you signed for those shares?—I cannot recollect the day.

18549. The month?—About two or three months since.

18550. Do you think it was in January?—About January, I think.

18551. Did you sign at the Poultry, at the office of the company?—Yes.

18552. Did you go alone?—Yes, alone I went.

18553. Did you take with you white scrip?—Yes.

18554. Who delivered it to you?—Lea Wilson, when I left Wood-street.

18555. And the money, the deposit?—Yes, 45 *l.*

18556. Was it a cheque or money?—To the best of my recollection, it was nine 5 *l.* notes.

18557. Were you in more than one room when you were at the Poultry?—I first went into the clerk's office.

18558. What took place there?—I told them what I came about, and they said that Mr. Dean was in the other room; I opened the door, and there I found Mr. Dean.

18559. Tell us what you said to him?—I told him I had called concerning the white scrip I had in my hand, and I wished to pay the deposit. I then entered my name in the book, and he gave me some blue scrip in the place of the white.

18560. Did Mr. Dean make any objection on account of your youth, or not knowing you?—None whatever.

18561. *Chairman.*] You say you entered your name in the book; what sort of a book?—A very large book.

18562. Was it on a piece of parchment?—Yes; also on a piece of parchment.

[*The Deed was shown to the Witness.*]

18563. Is that the sort of book?—Yes.

18564. Mr. *Rowe.*] Was there any one present but you and Mr. Dean?—No; yes, his clerk came in afterwards; that was as a witness.

18565. Did they make any objection of any kind?—No.

18566. He asked where you lived?—Yes; I do not know whether he asked me, but he could tell, because I put my address.

18567. Mr.

James Stride.
12 May 1837.

18567. Mr. *Lushington.*] In that book did you mention you were clerk to Messrs. Wilson?—No; I did not.

18568. Mr. *Rowe.*] Was the name of Messrs. Wilson mentioned?—No; it was not.

18569. Mr. *Lushington.*] Were you instructed by Mr. Wilson not to mention his name?—No.

18570. Did you purposely withhold his name?—I was not asked any questions concerning him.

18571. Did you purposely withhold it?—No.

18572. You were not aware you were doing what was improper?—No, but that I was doing what I was directed.

18573. If Mr. Dean had asked any question, if you were living with Mr. Wilson, should you have answered him?—Yes, I should.

18574. Would you have told him at once that the shares were not yours?—Yes, I should.

18575. You took the blue scrip back to Mr. Wilson?—Yes.

The cross-examination was postponed.

[The Witness withdrew.

George Walker, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

George Walker.

18576. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the party whose name appears on Rennie's deed in this way: "George Walker, 7, Old Change, draper, 35 shares, 2,625*l.*"?—Yes.

18577. Are you a draper in the Old Change?—I am a warehouseman.

18578. To a draper?—Yes.

18579. You are not a draper yourself?—Not the principal.

18580. Only warehouseman?—Yes, and light porter.

18581. Who is your principal?—Joseph Thomson.

18582. *Chairman.*] Is their address, Old Change, No. 7?—Yes.

18583. Mr. *Rowe.*] Do you live there, or only work there?—I live there, I am there in the day; I live with him, and sleep up in his private house; he does not live there himself.

18584. You say that you are a warehouseman; are you not employed as a light porter?—Yes, I am warehouseman and light porter.

18585. *Chairman.*] At what wages are you employed?—I have wages that I am allowed; I do not board altogether in the house; I have 24*l.* a year wages.

18586. What other advantages?—I have 10*l.* a year for my dinners, making 34*l.*

18587. Any other emoluments?—Nothing more.

18588. Mr. *Rowe.*] At the time you signed to this amount, 2,625*l.*, had you any ostensible property?—Not any; you mean had I property of my own?

18589. Yes.—I had not.

18590. In signing for those shares, did you sign on your own account?—On my master's.

18591. Did you take with you to the office white paper of this description?—Yes.

18592. Did your master deliver those to you?—Yes.

18593. Did you pay the deposit upon them?—Yes.

18594. Who supplied the money?—My master.

18595. By whose direction was it you put your name on the deed?—My master's.

18596. Did you pay in this money at the bankers', Messrs. Hankey's, or at the office in the Poultry?—I went with my master to the Poultry; he presented the cheque, and got notes for it; that was in the Poultry, and we went then to Fenchurch-street.

18597. Did you not go to Fenchurch-street first, and get the money?—No.

18598. Where did you go in the Poultry?—To Lubbocks', that is my master's bankers'.

18599. Where did you go then?—To Fenchurch-street.

18600. Is that Messrs. Hankey's?—Yes.

18601. Was it there you signed the deed?—Yes.

18602. Did you get a receipt?—I did.

18603. What did you do with it?—Give it to my master.

George Walker.

12 May 1837.

18604. Did you go to the Poultry at all with the receipt?—No.

18605. You gave that receipt into your master's hand?—Yes.

18606. From that time, do you know anything about it?—Nothing more.

18607. You never saw any blue papers?—Yes, I saw them two or three days ago; I had them; I brought them from the house.

18608. What house?—Where I signed the deed.

18609. Where did you sign the deed?—In Fenchurch-street.

18610. Did they deliver to you the blue papers there?—Yes.

18611. Are you sure of that?—Yes.

18612. Did they also give you a receipt when you paid the money?—I did not pay the money.

18613. Who did pay the money?—I paid the money when I signed the deed.

18614. You went first with your master to Lubbock's, then you went to Hankeys', there you paid the money and signed the deed?—Yes.

18615. What did they do then?—They gave me a receipt, and that I gave to my master.

18616. Where did you go then?—Nowhere.

18617. *Chairman.*] How did you come in possession of the blue paper?

18618. Mr. *Rowe.*] Did you not go back to the Poultry?—No.

18619. Do you know a place called Chapel-place in the Poultry?—Yes, I do.

18620. You must have been mistaken about the blue papers?—What I received was in Fenchurch-street, and I had nothing more to do with it; I handed it to my master; I saw nothing more of the transaction.

18621. You signed the deed, and you handed over the receipt to a third party?—Yes, to my master.

[The Witness withdrew.

John Haley, was again called in; and further Examined, as follows:

John Haley.

18622. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the party whose name appears on Rennie's subscription deed in this way: "John Haley, 8, Thomas-street, Mile-end, shopkeeper, five shares, 375 *l.*" and also "John Haley, 8, Thomas-street, Mile-end, shopkeeper, 10 shares, 750 *l.*"?—Yes.

18623. Can you tell me when you signed that deed?—I rather think it was in November 1836, or December; I rather think so.

18624. You have signed to the amount of rather more than 1,100 *l.*?—Yes.

18625. At the time you signed for 1,100 *l.*, were you worth it?—No.

18626 *Chairman.*] Were you able to pay the instalments due?—No, I was not.

18627. Mr. *Rowe.*] You call yourself a shopkeeper; what shop do you keep?—At the time I signed I was not in the shopkeeping line, but I had been previously.

18628. How came you to leave it?—I found it did not answer.

18629. You have become unfortunate?—Yes, rather unfortunate.

18630. Were you insolvent?—No, I was not, though my circumstances were not good.

18631. Were you in distressed circumstances?—Are you alluding to the time I signed the deed?

18632. Yes.—I was in reduced circumstances.

18633. What were you at that time; what means of livelihood had you?—I was jobbing in the share-market at that time.

18634. Was that your only means of support at that time?—Yes it was.

18635. On signing this deed, did you sign for yourself the first time?—Yes, I signed for myself.

18636. Did you pay 10 *l.* upon those ten shares?—Yes.

18637. Where did you get that money?—I borrowed it of a party.

18638. Where did you get the scrip?—I had previously bought the scrip in the market.

18639. Perhaps you will tell me what you gave for it?—One pound a share.

18640. *Chairman.*] Did you borrow the 10 *l.* with which you bought the white scrip?—No, it was for the subsequent paying up of the instalment of 1 *l.*

18641. Mr. *Rowe.*] I asked you, when you purchased the white scrip, when you went and paid the deposit, what did you give?—£. 1. a share; they were at 1 *l.* discount.

18642. You paid upon those ten shares an additional one pound?—Yes, subsequently.

18643. Now,

18643. Now, upon the five shares, what did you give for those originally, how much a share?—I rather think 17 *s.* 6 *d.* a share; I was jobbing; it might be about that.

18644. Did you pay the deposit upon them?—Yes, I did.

18645. A pound for each share?—Yes; the first I paid at Hankey's; the 10 *l.*; and five shares I paid at the office in the Poultry.

18646. *Chairman.*] Did you borrow the 5 *l.* to pay the deposit?—Yes, I did, on both occasions.

18647. Mr. *Rowe.*] Did you pay both at the bankers'?—No, I paid 10 *l.* at the bankers' for the first ten; that was on one day; I do not recollect the day; I think it was the next day or the day after in which I went to the Poultry and paid the remaining 5 *l.* upon the remaining five shares; I had not enough money at that time.

18648. Are you quite sure of that fact; I am told you are in error; it is said you paid both those sums of money at the bankers'?—No, I did not; I am convinced I am right; I recollect the circumstance well.

18649. The second time you went to the Poultry?—Yes.

18650. You presented the white scrip, paid in the money, and signed the deed and got the blue scrip?—Yes.

18651. Was that all done in one room?—Yes.

18652. Do you know who you saw?—I saw two gentlemen; I think one was the secretary, I rather think so.

18653. Do you know his name?—No, I do not; I forget his name; I think he has been pointed out to me since.

18654. Should you know him, if you saw him?—I think I should.

18655. The person to whom you paid the money, was he writing at a table?—Yes, he was.

18656. Are you quite sure that what you have been stating is correct; is it possible it may have been thus, that you paid the money to the bankers and got the receipts, and then went to the Poultry?—Yes, you understood me, probably, wrong; I had 15 of those white shares, and I had but 10 *l.* at the time; I had borrowed that, and took two of those papers, five shares each, and I presented 10 *l.*, and I signed the deed for 10 shares, and had the bankers' receipt, that is the first time; I had that in my pocket, and the next day or the day after I went to the Poultry, and signed for the remaining five shares, and received then the whole fifteen blue papers.

18656*. But you never went to the bankers' twice?—Decidedly.

18657. Was any objection made to your signing?—Not the least.

18658. Any questions asked who you came from?—Not by Mr. Dean.

18659. Was there any conversation about it?—No.

18660. Not before Mr. Dean?—No; I do not recollect that there was any conversation, further than I presented my scrip and signed the deed, the bankers' receipt for the 10 *l.*, and likewise the white scrip, and the 5 *l.*, which I paid to sign the deed for the whole 15 *l.*

18661. Have you signed the South Midland deed?—Yes.

18662. Was it for twenty shares?—Yes.

18663. Was that on your own account too?—Yes, at that time.

18664. Did you borrow the money?—No; I was better off at that time, and it was my own money. That is more than twelve months ago.

18665. Have you ever signed for other parties any of these deeds?—Yes; I signed on one occasion the Westminster and Deptford for another party, as I understood subsequently to that.

18666. Were you paid for signing it?—Yes.

18667. How much?—Ten shillings.

18668. I think you are a petitioner too here?—Yes.

18669. Tell me what induced you to present this petition; do you know George Jones?—Yes.

18670. He is a jobber?—Yes, I believe he is.

18671. On the Exchange?—Yes.

18672. Did he apply to you to petition?—Yes; he applied to me on the Saturday. He asked me relating to the circumstance, and I told him the truth, so far as regarded it; and he asked me if I had any objection to sign a petition, or something of that sort, and I said, No.

18673. Where did he take you to sign it?—He took me to Bridge-street.

John Haley.

12 May 1837.

18674. To Rennie's office?—Yes? they were not there on the Saturday, and he required me to come down on the Monday.

18675. What did Mr. Jones say to you, that made you go to sign the petition? —So far, as I should receive some remuneration.

18676. Mr. *Rowe.*] For signing the petition?—Decidedly so; coming all the way from Mile-end.

18677. That was the inducement to you to sign it?—So far as regarded that, I expected some remuneration for it.

18678. Do you remember what state you were in when you signed that petition?—No; I was sober, decidedly.

18679. You had had a little?—I had had something.

18680. And you signed it at Rennie's office?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

18681. Did you say you had signed several deeds?—Yes.

18682. When did you first begin to sign deeds?—The first deed was, I think, the South Midland, upwards of twelve months ago.

18683. Have you signed any deeds of companies that have since obtained their Acts of Parliament?—I do not exactly understand your question.

18684. Then I am afraid you are not a good jobber; have you signed any deeds on behalf of companies who have since obtained Acts of Parliament?—No; I do not know that I have. I can state the railroads I have signed.

18685. Is that the gentleman [*pointing to Mr. Dean*] that was in the office at the time you signed?—Yes, I think that is the gentleman.

18686. Be so good as to tell the Committee how many deeds you have subscribed?—I have mentioned the Westminster and Greenwich, and South Midland and Rennie's, and the South Western.

18687. Any other?—That is all, I think.

18688. Perhaps you are not sure?—I think those are the only railway deeds I have signed.

18689. And those fifteen shares you had bought in the market?—I had.

18690. Is it possible you may have mistaken one of the transactions; thus, you say one sum of money you paid to the bankers?—Yes.

18691. May it have happened, that in the last transaction you paid the money to the bankers, and then came from the bankers with the bankers' receipt and exchanged the scrip at the office in Chapel-place; may that have happened?—What I stated was, I paid the 10*l.* into the bankers'.

18692. I am speaking of the last transaction; did you get bankers' receipts for both payments?—I think I did not; I know I did for 10 *l.*; I think I took the 5 *l.*; I am almost sure.

18693. Are you quite sure? It is not of any very great importance, except to set you right, if you are wrong; can you undertake to tell the Committee, on the second occasion you did not pay the money to the bankers, and get a receipt for it, and come to the office of the company, and then, by virtue of that receipt evidencing your payment, obtain the scrip?—I am almost sure I did not.

18694. Are you sure of it?—I think that I did not.

18695. Can you be positive?—No, I cannot be positive; I think I did not; I am not speaking altogether positive, but that is my impression.

18696. You spoke about a petition, that my learned friend thought you were drunk when you signed it; did it contain anything but the truth?—No; certainly not.

18697. I take it for granted you would not have signed it if it had?—No certainly not.

[The Witness withdrew.

William Bourne, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

18698. Mr. *Rowe.*] WHERE do you reside?—In the Borough of Southwark.

18699. What are you?—A clerk to Mr. Crawshay.

18700. Have you made it your business to inquire in Coleharbour-lane, in Camberwell, for such a person as Alfred Ryder?—Yes, I have.

18701. Have you inquired very diligently?—Yes.

W. Bourne.

18702. And endeavoured to find him?—Yes.

18703. Can any such person be found there?—No such person was to be found there.

18704. Did you find any person of the name of Ryder in the neighbourhood?

hood?—Yes; after a great deal of diligent inquiry, I found a woman of the name of Ryder; a washerwoman.

18705. In very humble life?—Yes.

18706. Did you learn whether she had a son of the name of Alfred Ryder?—Yes, I did.

18707. Did you learn that she had?—Yes.

18708. Could she give you any information where you were to find him?—She said he lodged with her in that house, a very humble dwelling.

18709. Have you been there again?—No.

18710. You ascertained he lodged there?—Yes, he lodged in her house

18711. Did you learn what was the occupation of this party?—Yes.

18712. What was it?—She said he was clerk in Doctors' Commons.

18713. Did she give you the name of the person with whom he was a clerk—She said she did not know it.

18714. Could she give any account of his circumstances; did you ask whether he was a man of substance?—No; I thought from the appearance of the residence of the mother, it was very useless to ask such a question, it would have been an absurdity.

18715. Considering this man was down for 9,000 *l.*, his reputed residence you thought it unnecessary to inquire into, his circumstances?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

18716. Is it in Mr. Crawshay's iron-works' departments you are a clerk?—Yes.

18717. Is not Mr. Crawshay an active director of Stephenson's line, and constantly attending the committee?—He has not been a director long.

18718. Is not your employer, Mr. Crawshay, an active director of Stephenson's line?—Yes, he is so now; but I doubt whether he was when I made the inquiry.

18719. When did you make the inquiry?—A month ago.

18720. By whose direction did you make the inquiry?—Not his.

18721. Whose was it?—No one's, it was entirely spontaneously.

18722. What put it into your head to inquire for him?—Because it was a matter of notoriety, there were several improper names on the list.

18723. Who furnished you with the list to look at it?—One of the directors of Stephenson's line.

18724. What was his name?—Routh.

18725. Is he not the partner of Mr. Crawshay?—Yes.

18726. Has he not been an active director of Stephenson's line during both these sessions?—Yes.

18727. Is he your employer, as well as Mr. Crawshay?—Yes.

18728. Was it by his direction you made the inquiry?—No.

18729. Whose direction was it?—No one.

18730. What passed between you and Mr. Routh upon the subject?—Previous to the making the inquiry, nothing whatever.

18731. What passed when he furnished you with a list of the signatures?—Nothing but of a very general character.

18732. Let us have what it was?—He said nothing whatever about Ryder.

18733. Let me know the purport of the conversation, whether general or particular?—That a great many names were fictitious altogether.

18734. What made you fix upon Ryder?—I resided in the neighbourhood a very long while, and it was a matter of convenience to me to walk in that neighbourhood, more for amusement than anything else, and I made the inquiry.

18735. Did you make any inquiry about any one else?—Yes.

18736. Who?—Two others.

18737. Besides Ryder?—Yes.

18738. Were they living in the same neighbourhood?—No.

18739. Did you make inquiry after them for your amusement?—No.

18740. By whose direction was it?—By Mr. Routh's.

18741. Did he direct you to inquire about both those?—Yes.

18742. Where did he send you to make inquiries?—Is it essential to answer that question?

18743. *Chairman.*] Yes?—I cannot tell without the list.

18744. Mr. *Alexander.*] Where did you go to?—To the neighbourhood of the west end of the town.

W. Bourne.
12 May 1837.

18745. But Alfred Ryder was not mentioned to you by Mr. Routh or Mr. Crawshay?—No.

18746. Did those two directors of Stephenson's line go over the list with you?—They looked at the list with me in a general way.

18747. What do you mean?—As a matter of general conversation.

18748. You say they were both there?—No, Mr. Routh alone.

18749. Did Mr. Crawshay afterwards look over it with you?—No.

18750. You are in the habit of seeing Mr. Routh every day almost?—Yes.

18751. The counting-house is in the Borough?—No, the counting-house is in Upper Thames-street; my residence is in the Borough.

18752. Was it there, at the counting-house, the list was handed to you?—Yes.

18753. Did you find, from Alfred Ryder's mother, where he was a clerk at Doctors' Commons?—No, she said she did not know.

18754. Did you pursue your inquiries further?—No.

18755. Did you go to Doctors' Commons?—No.

18756. You made no further inquiry at Camberwell?—No.

18757. What are the names of the other parties?—One is Cooke and another Rogers; one was in Seymour-street, and the other at the Addison-road.

[The Witness withdrew.

The further consideration of the Brighton Railway case was adjourned to Friday next, at Eleven o'clock.

[For Evidence, Question 18758 to Q. 18831 inclusive, *see* Fourth Report, p. 110.]

Veneris, 19° *die Maii*, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Chalmers.	Mr. Thornely.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. Warburton.
Mr. C. Lushington.	

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Antonio Joachim Soares*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *A. J. Soares.*
19 May 1837.

18832. Mr. *Austin.*] WHERE do you live?—My habitation, where I go to live, is at Highbury, but my office is at 36, Crutched Friars.

18833. What office are you speaking of?—My uncle's office.

18834. What is your uncle's name?—Manuel Joachim Soares.

18835. What business does your uncle carry on?—He is a merchant; it is a commission house.

18836. Are you connected with him in his business?—No; I am going there learning.

18837. What are you; are you a clerk there?—I am an apprentice.

18838. How long have you been apprenticed to your uncle?—A year and a a half.

18839. How old are you?—I was 18 when I was apprenticed, or 17½, and I am 19 to-morrow.

18840. How old were you when you subscribed this deed of Rennie's Brighton line?—It was last year.

18841. You were 18?—Yes.

18842. How much did you subscribe for?—Two hundred shares.

18843. How much is that in money?—£. 15,000.

18844. How much deposit did you pay?—I do not recollect how much I deposited there; I went to my uncle, and asked him for the money, and he gave me a cheque, and I went there and paid it.

18845. You do not know the amount of the deposit?—No.

18846. Where did you go to pay the deposit?—I believe it was in Fenchurch-street; it was a banker's; I forget the name.

18847. Messrs. Hankey's?—Yes.

18848. Did

18848. Did you take anything there besides the cheque?—I took the shares, to show that I had them.

18849. Pieces of white paper?—Yes, and my uncle has them.

18850. Where did you get them?—From my uncle.

18851. Where did he get them?—I believe he got them from one of the directors: he made me a present of them.

18852. Which of the directors; do you know?—I think it was Mr. Sutton; I do not know, but I believe it was.

18853. Why do you believe it was Mr. Sutton?—I do not know; I heard of a gentleman going there at different times, and I heard my uncle say he belonged to the family of the Suttons, and he is called so.

18854. Did you see somebody with your uncle on more than one occasion, who said he belonged to the firm of Messrs. Sutton?—He was some relation or other of Mr. Sutton; he did not belong to the firm.

18855. Was that the gentleman from whom the shares were got?—I do not know, but I believe so.

18856. You do not know how much you paid upon each share?—No, I do not.

18857. Did you get any blue certificates back?—I believe they gave me some papers.

18858. What colour were they?—I believe they were blue.

18859. They were coloured papers?—Yes; I do not know what colour they were.

18860. You signed the deed yourself?—Yes.

18861. In your own name?—Yes.

18862. Where did you get those pieces of blue paper?—At the bankers'.

18863. Just recollect?—I never went anywhere else; I do not know where I got them.

18864. You are sure you got them at the bankers'?—I believe I did.

18865. What have you done with them?—I gave them to my uncle; what ever the papers were, my uncle has got them.

18866. Have you not got them?—No; I had them not in my possession an hour; I delivered them up.

18867. To your uncle?—Yes.

18868. I did not catch your uncle's name; it is not Antonio Soares?—No; Manuel Joachim.

18869. You signed in your own name?—Yes.

18870. And you have heard nothing more about them from that time to this?—No.

18871. You have never seen the certificate since?—No.

18872. Have you ever seen that gentleman since?—I never spoke to him; I believe I have seen him once; I know him only by sight.

18873. Where was it you signed the deed, at the bankers'?—Yes, I believe so.

18874. Do you feel confident about it?—Yes; I did not do it anywhere else; I have been to other companies, but not to the Brighton anywhere else.

18875. You think you got the blue certificates there?—Yes.

18876. That is your present impression?—Yes.

18877. Who gave them to you?—I do not know; it was a gentleman that was there.

18878. Have you subscribed to any other companies?—Yes, I have.

18879. About the same time?—Last year was about the time; it was about a month after.

18880. Did you subscribe to any before this?—Not that I recollect.

18881. How many have you subscribed since?—Two, since.

18882. What sums?—I do not know the different sums.

18883. Do you mean one sum to one company and another to another?—Yes.

18884. What was the largest sum?—This Brighton Railway.

18885. That makes three companies?—Yes.

18886. What was the next largest sum you subscribed?—I think this is the one.

18887. You said this was the largest?—Yes.

 18888. Which

Mr. *A. J. Soares.*

19 May 1837.

18888. Which did you sign second?—I do not recollect now; I do not keep it in my memory in this sort of way; I go on with different things.

18889. Try and recollect what were the names of the two companies you subscribed to?—It was private companies.

18890. Railroads?—One is a railroad and the other is not.

18891. The railroad is the one I wish to know about; when did you subscribe to the next?—I do not recollect the time.

18892. Do you recollect the name?—It was the Altona Railway.

18893. That was about a month afterwards?—Yes.

18894. In your own name also?—Yes.

Cross-Examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

18895. When did you hear you were first to be brought here?—On Friday last.

18896. This day week?—Last week, I believe it was; I am not quite sure; last Tuesday I received a letter.

18897. A summons, what you call a letter?—Yes.

18898. Who came to you?—A gentleman.

18899. Who came to you last Friday?—That gentleman there (*pointing to a gentleman behind Mr. Leman.*)

18900. You do not know his name?—No, I do not.

18901. You say your uncle is a merchant?—Yes.

18902. Did you ever see the white scrip you took to the bankers' till it was shown to you by your uncle?—No; he gave them to me, and looking at them, I saw it was a certificate, and I shut it and did not look at anything else.

18903. You never saw it before it was shown to you then by your uncle?—No, not till I got the shares.

18904. Is your uncle a merchant in large business?—Yes; he is a commission merchant.

18905. Does he carry on an extensive business?—Yes, he does.

18906. Is he a man of considerable property?—He has got something or another to live on; I do not know quite particularly his character.

18907. Is he a gentleman who moves in a good circle of society?—Yes, he is a respectable gentleman; his is the first Portuguese house in London.

18908. How long has he been established?—Twenty-five years.

18909. Do I understand you to have said you saw a gentleman at your uncle's before your uncle gave you the scrip?—Which scrip?

18910. The white scrip.—I did not say I saw him before; I saw him there; I cannot say whether it was before or after: I have seen him at different times there, or twice.

18911. But whether those times were before or after you went to the bankers' in Fenchurch-street, you do not know?—Yes; I saw him after I went to the bankers'.

18912. Are you sure that both the times you saw him at your uncle's was after the time you had been to the bankers' in Fenchurch-street?—Yes.

18913. When you went to the bankers' in Fenchurch-street, did you receive a receipt for the money you paid?—Certainly; I should not have come away without it.

18914. Did you give the receipt to your uncle?—All the papers that they gave me in return for the cheque I gave them to my uncle.

18915. All the papers you received at the bankers' you gave to your uncle?—Yes.

18916. Can you recollect what papers you received for the papers you produced?—Yes; of course I received the shares back and the receipt.

18917. Do you recollect that the shares were blue?—I believe so; I cannot recollect the colour exactly.; I did not see it to look very particularly at them.

18918. Was it by a cheque you received from your uncle, of whatever amount, you paid for exchanging the white scrip when you took your receipt at the bankers'; was it the very same cheque?—I do not quite understand that.

18919. I thought I understood you to tell Mr. Austin, that before you went to

to the banker's with the white scrip, you received from your uncle a cheque to pay?—Yes.

18920. Was it with that same cheque you received that you made the payment at Messrs. Hankeys', the bankers?—Yes.

18921. And your own memory will not furnish you with the amount of that cheque?—No, it will not.

18922. Have you seen in the possession of your uncle those papers that you say you gave back to him?—No; he has got them in his private case.

18923. As you believe; you have not seen them?—No.

18924. Might this have been about the 15th of last November?—Yes, it might be.

18925. Is your uncle at present in England, and in London?—Yes.

18926. And would have attended this Committee if he had been brought here?—He has nothing to do with it.

18927. How do you mean he has nothing to do with it?—The shares are mine; I gave them to my uncle to keep for me.

18928. Have the goodness to explain more at large to the Committee what passed between you and your uncle on the subject of these shares?—I heard him say that a railway company was going to be established to make a railway from London to Brighton, and speaking to him one time, I said I thought it was a very good opportunity for my getting in, to see if I could get a profit upon them. He said, "Very well, I will lend you the money." I said, "Oh, thank you." He said, "I have spoken about those shares; I will get them, and make you a present of them."

18929. Was it after that conversation with your uncle you received from him the white scrip, to do what you represent you did at the bankers'?—Yes; and he gave me a cheque, as he did other people.

18930. I suppose all that passed with you at the bankers' was presenting the white scrip and receiving what you did receive there?—Yes.

18931. Had you any conversation with the people at the bankers' about the connexion between you and your uncle?—No.

18932. You tendered the shares as being yours, and they exchanged them for the blue scrip in exchange for the money and the white scrip?—Yes.

18933. Have you property of your own?—Yes, I have; but I am a minor, and cannot possess it.

18934. You said you were an apprentice; are you an apprentice by any deed, or merely a clerk, learning the business in order to come into the business?—It is the first time I went into any business.

18935. You are not bound by any deed?—No; I live with him; I am always with him, and he takes me to the office to teach me the business.

18936. Has your uncle any house in Portugal?—No.

18937. Or any other place than England?—No.

18938. Had you been in business anywhere else before you came to England?—No.

18939. Is it intended by your uncle you should come into the business with him when you have learned the business sufficiently?—No, I do not think he has that intention to me to make me a partner.

18940. You say you believe your uncle got the shares from one of the directors; do you know whether he purchased them or not?—I do not know; I dare say he purchased them; I do not know how he did it; they were not given to him; certainly not.

18941. Mr. *Austin.*] Do you know that?—I am quite positive of it.

18942. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Did you ever see any strange gentleman, or any gentleman, upon the subject of these shares before you received the shares from your uncle, together with the cheque, to go and exchange them?—I never saw them before.

18943. When you say you believe that your uncle obtained them from a director, do you mean that you believe he obtained them in the ordinary way in which shares are obtained?—Yes.

18944. You have named Mr. Sutton; do you know Mr. Sutton?—Yes, I know Mr. Sutton.

18945. Which Mr. Sutton is it you know?—I know the father and the two sons.

18946. What is the father?—A stockbroker.

Mr. *A. J. Soares.*

19 May 1837.

18947. Is one of the sons a stockbroker?—Yes.

18948. Did you ever see the father or either of the sons at your uncle's office until after you had got those shares from your uncle?—I never saw Mr. Sutton in the house about those shares; I saw that gentleman, and I understood he was belonging to the family of the Suttons.

18949. Do you know Mr. Swabey when you see him?—Who is he?

18950. When you saw a gentleman whom you say you believe was connected with, or part of the family of the Suttons, was it before or after you had been at the bankers' with the shares?—I believe, if I am not much mistaken, it was after I had acquired possession of the shares.

18951. It was not till after that you saw that gentleman you believe to be connected with the family of the Suttons?—I have seen him twice.

18952. Should you know that gentleman again if you were to see him?—I dare say I should.

18953. You say you know Mr. Sutton, the elder, and the two sons, who are stockbrokers?—Yes.

18954. It was not either of these three gentlemen?—No.

Re-examined by Mr. *Austin.*

18955. You say you know Mr. Sutton, the father, and the two sons?—Yes.

18956. Does your uncle know them?—Yes.

18957. You are rather intimate with them?—Rather.

18958. And were so before you changed those shares at the bankers'?—Yes.

18959. Do you know whether this gentleman you have been speaking of was Mr. Swabey, or not?—No, I do not.

18960. Do you know Mr. Swabey, the son-in-law of Mr. Sutton?—No, I do not; I know Mr. Sutton, the father, and the Mr. Suttons, the sons.

18961. Are either of the three Mr. Suttons you know directors in this company?—I do not think they are; I am not quite sure.

18962. You say you think the shares were not given to your uncle?—I think so.

18963. Do you know how he got them?—No.

18964. I do not understand you to give any account of the mode in which he got them?—No, I do not.

18965. When you say that you believe he bought them, you only believe it from the fact of his having them?—Yes; he had them, and he ought to get them somewhere, in some way or other.

18966. You suppose he bought them?— Yes.

18967. I understood you to say he made you a present of those shares?—Yes, he did.

18968. You went with the white shares to the bankers', and you received a receipt at the bankers'?—For the cheque.

18969. And you signed the deed?—Yes, I did.

18970. What did you do with the receipt?—I gave them up to my uncle.

18971. Now try and recollect whether you had any blue certificate or not?—That is impossible for me to say.

18972. You will not undertake to say at this time you had the blue certificates?—I will not say the colour.

18973. Will you say you had any certificate at all; you never went to the Poultry?—No.

18974. Just try and recollect whether you had a coloured certificate in exchange; you gave a cheque and signed the deed; had you anything besides the receipt when you came back?—I brought the shares back.

18975. What shares?—The company's certificate of them.

18976. Instead of the shares you had carried there?—Yes.

18977. You brought back those and the receipt?—Yes.

18978. Those papers you gave to your uncle?—Yes.

18979. You know the word scrip?—Not very well; I have heard it very often.

18980. Let me understand; you gave your uncle the receipt and certificates?—Yes, I gave everything to him.

18981. You gave him the receipts and you gave him the certificates?—I gave him all the papers together.

18982. Were

Mr. *A. J. Soares.*

19 May 1837.

18982. Were not the certificates you gave your uncle back with the receipt the same certificates he had given to you?—As I have said I never looked at them so particular as that; I gave them back to him.

18983. Whatever it was you took back from the clerk of the bankers, you gave to your uncle?—Yes.

18984. You never went to the Poultry?—No.

18985. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You gave them back to your uncle?—Yes, to keep for me; he always keeps everything that is mine.

18986. Mr. *Austin.*] Did you give your uncle any instruction to take the certificates to the Poultry, or ask him to do so?—No.

18987. You never heard anything more of the transaction?—No.

18988. Do you know whether they have been exchanged?—I do not know.

18989. Have you ever asked anything about them?—I have asked him how they are going on, and whether the Bill is passed; for I take an interest in it, to see if they come to something.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

Mr. *Robert Huckvale* was called in; and further Examined, as follows:

18990. Mr. *Rowe.*] DO you produce here to-day your cash-book for the month of January last?—Yes.

18991. Have the goodness to look at it, and have the goodness to refer to the month of January [*The Witness produced and referred to a book*]?—Any particular day?

18992. You said you would bring with you your bankers' book; have you got that?—Yes; these are all the books I have got.

18993. We spoke, when you were last here, of a transaction in shares that passed through the hands of Samuel Carr?—Yes.

18994. Which passed into his hands from yours?—Yes.

18995. Taking those shares to be about 2,000?—Yes, that was the number.

18996. Which passed from you into the hands of Mr. Carr in the month of January; can you, by referring to your cash-book, and looking at the amount of those shares which passed in three or four different lots—I will give you the numbers—find out in your cash-book in the month of January any entry that leads you to such a number of shares as 819?—I have got no number of shares; I have only got the amount I paid in, and the amount I drew out; it does not state what it was for.

18997. You recollect the number of shares first handed to Mr. Carr was 819?—I do not recollect the number, but it might be so.

18998. Do you find any entry there that will enable you to state the number of shares you handed to Mr. Carr on the first occasion?—No, I cannot tell you anything of the sort by this; I have only the names and the amounts in money.

18999. Have the goodness to refer to the bankers' book, you may get at it in that way; do you find any entry of the advance of the deposit of 1 *l.* per share upon 819 shares; do you find such a sum entered as 819 *l.* in the month of January, which would be a draft upon your bankers to that amount [*The Witness referred to his bankers' book.*]?—That does not follow; I can read over the amounts to you any day during the month, if you please.

19000. No, I do not wish you to do that; but you have stated that when you first gave the shares to Carr to take to the Poultry, you gave him cash to pay the deposits?—Yes.

19001. Do you find any entry in the bankers' book that will lead you to the amount of the deposit you put into his hands to take with the shares?—I see there is something on account of Rennie's Line, 104 *l.*

19002. What is the date of that?—January 17th.

19003. £.104 on account of Rennie's shares?—Yes.

19004. Was that money received by you, or money paid?—Money I paid.

19005. Will you look further; do you see anything like 819 *l.*?—No, there is nothing of the sort; that would not be the sum, I expect.

19006. Money paid by you on account of the deposit?—I see I have got Rennie's 104 *l.*, on account of Frith; that was paid over for him.

19007. *Chairman.*] Is there any entry for 715 *l.*—No.

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

19 May 1837.

19008. Mr. *Rowe.*] Is there any other entry in the course of that month in which the name of Rennie's shares appears?—No, that is the only one.

19009. Throughout the month, is there any transaction with Messrs. Sutton's house?—I could undertake to say there was not, without looking, but I will look; no, there is not any transaction with Messrs Sutton's house appearing here.

19010. Will you look further, and see if there is any entry of the sum of 500*l.* paid by you; that would be a deposit on 500 shares?—In what month?

19011. In January.—No, I do not see any; I will read over every item in the month, if you wish it.

19012. No, I do not wish it. You find no entry of 500*l.*, paid on account of Rennie's shares?—No.

19013. Nor any such sum?—No.

19014. Now, have the goodness to refer to the bankers' book; you have told us before you paid the deposit upon 500 shares in cash, that is to say, you gave it to Carr?—Yes.

19015. Have the goodness to see in your bankers' book whether you find any sum of money like that?—No.

19016. You find no such sum?—No.

19017. That would make altogether 1,319*l.*?—I have only 104*l.* down in my book.

19018. I am not supposing you have told me so, but putting 819*l.* and 500*l.* together, it will make 1,319*l.* altogether; see if there is any sum to that amount in your cash-book or bankers' book?—No, there is no amount like it.

19019. Now, we have been told there were 510 shares afterwards signed for by Poulton, and you have told us you went and took up a portion of them yourself; did you pay cash for them?—Yes.

19020. Have the goodness to see if you have any entry of that sum?—No.

19021. Have you looked at the bankers' book too?—That is the same thing, one is a copy of the other.

19022. Is it a check or a copy?—They are alike.

19023. How do you keep that book?—One is deposited at the bankers', and the other I keep.

19024. Then it is a check and not a copy?—Yes.

19025. You have not got that sum?—No.

19026. We have been told about 307 shares signed for by Henry Cooke; you have told us you employed Cooke to sign for a certain number of shares, and you gave him the cash to pay the money; do you see any sum of that kind for 307 shares?—I had no engagement for 307 shares; I never gave that in evidence.

19027-28. What was the amount you gave?—Between 100 and 200 shares.

19029. Refer to your book, and see if you have any entry of any sum between 100*l.* and 200*l.*?—It was in December.

19030. Have the goodness to refer to December?—No, there is no such entry.

19031. Putting all those things together, am I to take it in this way; putting it upon your own statement of 100*l.* or 200*l.*, the gross sums I have given you would amount to somewhat above 2,000*l.*; do you mean to tell the Committee that shares to that amount passed through your hands; that you bought those shares and paid money for them; and that you sent them afterwards to be exchanged, and paid the deposits upon them, and you have no entry of any of those sums?—No, none; I could explain it to you.

19032. Have the goodness to explain how it is that that transaction does not appear in your bankers' book or cash-book?—I had the cash from Mr. Frith, and I suppose that this sum of 104*l.* was most likely a part of it; that is put down as going to Mr. Frith; it is on account of Mr. Frith.

19033. Do you find any entries of money received from Mr. Frith; might you first receive the shares and pay for them, and then send them to the office and pay the deposit on them?—Yes; I had the money of Mr. Frith to pay for them; it was not my money.

19034. For the whole of the shares?—No, the new shares.

19035. When you say you purchased the new shares, do you mean when you exchanged them?—Yes, the new for the old ones.

19036. Then

19036. Then do I understand you right, in all the monies you advanced for the deposits upon the exchange of old for new scrip you received the whole of the money from Mr. Frith?—Not all; here is 104*l.*

19037. All but the sum of 104*l.*?—Yes.

19038. Is that the way in which you account for that large sum of money, near 2,000*l.*, that you received that money, with that exception, from Mr. Frith?—Yes.

19039. Having been in possession of shares to that amount, have you no entry of the purchase-money paid out by you for this white scrip?—I have different names down, and I dare say I paid for Rennie's old shares; I could read the whole names through the month, but I could not state what they were for.

19040. Then you account for having this number that you had collected them from different parties?—Yes.

19041. Have you got the names of any of them?—I cannot say what the money was paid for; it might be for Stephenson's.

19042. Have you the names of the parties from whom you bought?—I dare say I have, but I cannot point them out; it may be for Spanish or consols.

19043. You are unable to fix any name from whom you bought Rennie's shares?—Yes; I could not positively say.

19044. If you received the whole of this money from Mr. Frith, to the amount of 2,000 *l.*, be so good as to tell me what interest you had in them?—I had an equal interest in them with himself; just at that time there was a good deal going on in them.

19045. If Mr. Frith advanced the whole of the deposits upon the whole of the shares, how had you an interest in them?—Every transaction passed through his hands; if I bought shares at that time I sold them to him, and made a joint account of it.

19046. If you had an interest in those shares, or one-half of them, or one-third, or one-fourth, how do you account for Mr. Frith paying the whole of the deposit?—It was arranged amongst us that he should do so.

19047. Tell me the arrangement; did he lend the money to you?—He let me have the money for the purpose.

19048. Was it his money, or did he lend it to you?—It was his money; it passed through his hands. I had the money from him.

19049. Was the money lent to you on your own responsibility, or was Mr. Frith advancing it on his own account?—It was advanced to me on my responsibility till I returned the new shares.

19050. Am I to take it in this way, that you were nothing but an agent?—No; I had a joint interest with him.

19051. *Chairman.*] Was he to find all the money, and you none?—In some cases I might lend him money when he wanted money.

19052. Can you not explain the nature of the transaction as regards Mr. Frith?—No, I cannot explain it otherwise than I have done.

19053. Mr. *Rowe.*] You have told us that those shares were yours, or you have told us you had an interest in these shares?—Yes, and so I had.

19054. You have told us that the deposit upon those shares must have amounted to near 2,000 *l.*, and it appears that that large sum does not occur in your bankers' book or in your cash-book?—No, it was paid at different times.

19055. I want you to explain why Mr. Frith should advance this large sum upon shares that were yours?—Part of them were mine; but it was at two or three different times. Suppose in December we had bought 500 between us, it would require only 500 *l.* to pay the call. Those shares, before I made the payment upon any, were sold in fives, tens or hundreds, and gone to different brokers.

19056. I am speaking of the actual fact, not of shares sold, but those you had to sell, 819 at one time and 500 at another, and 510 which you went and took up in the name of Poulton; I say nothing about Mr. Stokes now; but you having stated that those shares passed from you to Mr. Carr, and you having stated you advanced to Carr cash for the deposits upon those shares, how could they be yours if Mr. Frith paid the money for them?—He kept the account of the whole; there were three of us, Mr. Frith, Mr. Whitton and myself; we were partners for the time being; we had equal shares.

19057. Did Mr. Frith advance part on his own account and part on your account?—It was on my account as well as his own; it was of very little conse-

Mr. *R. Huckvale.*

19 May 1837.

quence who paid it; if I had drawn money I should have paid it, or Mr. Frith or Mr. Whitton.

19058. Have you any memorandum that will enable you to say what became of those shares afterwards?—They went into Mr. Frith's hands again. I have no entry of the sort.

19059. Do you find any entry of any sums received by you on account of those shares, or were they merely transferred to Mr. Frith?—They were given back to Mr. Frith.

19060. Then I take it in this way; you received the shares from Mr. Frith, and received the deposits from Mr. Frith, and then handed back the new blue scrip to Mr. Frith?—Yes, that is it exactly.

19061. You received no money from him then?—No; I had already received the money upon them; he received new shares.

19062. You drew no money from your bankers to pay the deposit?—No; if I drew money from my bankers I paid Mr. Frith. I have entries here of money paid to Mr. Frith; and when he had many shares on his hands probably I advanced him money.

19063. Can you tell what money you paid to Mr. Frith during that time?—Yes; I see there is this 104 *l.* I paid to him, and afterwards Frith 100 *l.*; that is on January 17th; there was 204 *l.* I lent Mr. Frith.

19064. Is there any other sum in the course of that month that you can fix as money paid to Mr. Frith?—No; these are the only two amounts; there are one or two small items of 8 *l.* 5 *s.*, but that was to pay for some other shares, I suppose.

19065. That being so, that you neither paid the money originally nor paid the deposit, were you anything more than the agent of Mr. Frith?—Yes; I had an equal interest with him in the shares; there were three of us had an equal interest; we were jobbing together, to use a technical phrase.

19066. You exchanged the shares, and Mr. Frith supplied the money?—I gave the old shares up for the new shares, and had the money from Mr. Frith.

19067. And gave the shares back to Mr. Frith?—Yes.

19068. *Chairman.*] If there was a gain upon those shares you were to share it between you, and if there was a loss you were to share it between you?—Exactly so.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Edward Frith* was called in; and further Examined, as follows:

Mr. *Edward Frith.*

19069. Mr. *Rowe.*] YOU were good enough to tell us, the last time you were here, you would produce your jobbing-book for the month of January; have you got it with you?—Yes, I have; shall I give it to you?

19070. No; answer my questions by referring to your book. [*The Witness produced a memorandum-book.*]

19071. Before you look at your book, we have been told by Mr. Huckvale that in the course of the month of January he received from you 2,000 shares in Rennie's Brighton, more or less, in the course of that month; is that so?—I cannot tell, without taking out each separate transaction and making a balance; but I should think not; I cannot say yes or no without doing that.

19072. Did you, in the course of January last, hand over to Mr. Huckvale a great many shares in Rennie's Brighton?—Yes, a good many.

19073. Can you tell me the names of any of the parties from whom you purchased those shares, the old white scrip?—Yes, I think I can tell you the whole of them I did not invariably mark them old or new, because I did not always know.

19074. Do you find that you purchased any of those shares from Sutton's house?—I will see [*referring to his memorandum-book.*] On January the 5th I bought 90 shares, not saying whether old or new, at 1 ¼ discount; I think they must have been the old shares, from Sutton & Company, and 20 new shares, which I have got marked at 1 ⅜ discount.

19075. When I say from Suttons', I do not mean Messrs. Suttons only, but anybody doing business with their house?—I should enter it Sutton & Company; I do not see any other bargain.

19076. Look at the month of December antecedent?—On the 3d of December, 25 Rennie's, bought of Sutton & Company, new shares, those paid up; now

on

on the 2d of December, 50 new Rennie's, bought of Sutton; only I cannot recollect whether that is Sutton & Company, or of another Sutton there is on the Stock Exchange; that is all I see in that month.

19077. Will you look in the month of November?—Yes; I do not see any other there at all.

19078. Now, direct your attention to the month of January; you say that you handed a very large number of shares to Mr. Huckvale to be exchanged; Mr. Huckvale has told us you paid the whole of the deposit on those shares?—I think he must have made a mistake; I do not think it was anything like that amount; I paid some hundreds, but not being all my shares, I did not pay the whole; I rather think I paid some and Mr. Whitton paid some.

19079. Do you remember or do you not whether you handed over to Mr. Huckvale anything like the sum of 2,000*l.*?—No, I think he has made a very great mistake; I should think it very considerably under 1,000*l.*; I should think it under 1,000*l.*, but I cannot say positively; he may have mixed me up with Mr. Whitton in the matter; Mr. Whitton may have paid him some money.

19080. Will you have the goodness to explain what was the nature of the transaction between you and Mr. Huckvale and Mr. Whitton in respect of those shares, taking it that you did hand him over a large number of shares in January, and state how you were interested?—In jobbing in Rennie's; at that time, there was very little business doing, and I believe we did the whole of it; there was nobody else jobbing in them; we jobbed together; it was a sort of partnership in Rennie's; so that whether Mr. Huckvale bought any, or I bought any, or Mr. Whitton bought any, it was all the same thing, and I entered them in my book as bought of Mr. Huckvale or Mr. Whitton; therefore, whatever shares there were at the last, they were the joint property of us three.

19081. *Chairman.*] Were you each of you to make the like advances and share the profit?—There it is a matter of no consequence; if a man says to me I want 500*l.* for an hour, or till the afternoon, I give it him and he gives me his cheque; and if I want a sum he lends me the money; we lend money as we do shares.

19082. Mr. *Rowe.*] With regard to Mr. Huckvale and Mr. Whitton, was your arrangement this, that you were to divide the profit if there was profit, and divide the loss if there was loss?—Yes, upon the whole transaction.

19083. That being so, do you think it probable that you advanced the whole deposit?—No, but I should not have hesitated about it; sometimes you draw your account close in jobbing, and you get it from some other person; I ask a person for 500*l.* Bank, and he gives me notes for it, and I give him a cheque.

19084. Mr. Huckvale has said, that after having caused those shares to be exchanged, he handed them over to you?—I think there must have been a mistake in that; he must have sold some himself; I did not sell the whole of them; I do not see why they should have all gone through my hands, when he had got to deliver shares himself most likely; they might have come to me and been returned by me to him, as shares sold by me to him.

19085. In the course of the month of January, after the 17th of January, did you sell any of Rennie's new scrip?—I have not the slightest doubt I did; yes, certainly.

19086. Just give me the amount?—All of them?

19087. Yes, all Rennie's new scrip you sold in that month?—Some I have marked new and some are not marked as new; I was not very particular at the time; if they were new I paid an extra pound, and if not I paid a pound short.

19088. Do you know that Rennie's old scrip was not saleable after a fixed day in January?—Whether it was January, I do not know, but there was a fixed day; but it was only nominally not saleable, it was not so in fact; everything is saleable that anybody will buy, and many people bought old Rennie's, though the company said they would not be exchanged, under the notion that they could make the company exchange them.

19089. Give us, as near as you can, the number of new Rennie's shares you sold in January?—Those marked new I will mention; but I know that some of those shares I have marked "Rennie's" only were new shares.

19090. I ask to the best of your belief and the means you have of judging?—The probabilities are that most of them are new, for the last day of payment was about January. Can you tell me the last day of payment?

Mr. *Edward Frith.*

19 May 1837.

19091. The 18th of January.—Very likely then these may be old Rennie's; I will give them indiscriminately; I cannot divide them. Upon the 3d of January I sold 20 and 50, that is all on the 3d; on the 4th, 5, 50, 10, 5, and 20; on the 5th, 50, 5, and 100; on the 6th there is nothing; on the 7th, 5, and 30; on the 9th, 10; on the 10th, 5; on the 11th, 15; on the 12th, 10; on the 16th, 120 and 200; on the 17th, 10, 5, 119, 150 and 30; on the 18th, 10, 50, 50, 5, 110, 60, 300, 100, 10, 5 and 40; on the 20th, 20; on the 21st, 20; on the 24th, 5; on the 25th, 50; on the 26th, 50; on the 27th, 50 and 5; on the 28th, 20; on the 30th, 50 and 10; on the 31st, 10, 25, 25 and three tens.

19092. That is the whole of January?—Yes.

19093. Have you any means of giving us,—I do not wish to have them,—but have you any means of giving us the names of the parties to whom you sold those shares?—Yes, certainly.

19094. Can you specify what amount of those shares in January, if any, you sold to Sutton's people?—Yes; not one.

19095. Can you tell me whether Mr. Whitton had any hand in the sale of those shares in which you had a joint interest?—Yes; most likely those shares I sold to Mr. Whitton he sold to somebody.

19096. Can you tell me what number of those passed into Mr. Whitton's hands?—As I said before, I am not certain whether they were new or old.

19097. I am taking them as you give them to me?—There is 20 on the 3d.

19098. I shall save time if I direct your attention to the name of Huckvale; how many of those shares, if any, went to Mr. Whitton, and how many, if any, went to Mr. Huckvale; and I am told there is a party called Jones to whom you sold?—I may have done business very likely with a Mr. Jones.

19099. I am told that some of those shares went into the hands of a person of the name of Jones?—I do not know it.

19100. On the 3d you sold 20 to Mr. Whitton?—Yes, and 50 to Mr. Huckvale; and on the 4th, 50 to Mr. Whitton, and 5 on the same day, and 10 to Mr. Huckvale, and 20 more to Mr. Whitton; on the 5th here is 50 to Mr. Whitton.

19101. Nothing more on the 5th to Mr. Whitton?—There is no more on the 5th.

19102. Any to Mr. Huckvale on the 5th?—No.

19103. Now the next?—The 6th was Sunday, I suppose; there is nothing on the 6th; nothing on the 7th; on the 9th, 10 to Mr. Whitton; on the 10th, 5 to Mr. Huckvale; on the 11th, 15 to Mr. Whitton; on the 13th, 5 to Mr. Whitton.

19104. You gave us none on the 13th in your original calculation?—No, it is Dublin; I was thinking of his name, and not thinking of what they were.

19105. Direct your attention to the 12th; you say you sold 10?—Yes, but not to Mr. Huckvale or Mr. Whitton.

19106. The next day you gave was the 16th?—None on the 16th; 119 to Huckvale on the 17th, 150 to Mr. Whitton, and 30 to Mr. Whitton.

19107. Now the 18th?—110 to Mr. Whitton, 60 to Mr. Whitton, 300 to Mr. Huckvale; that is how some of the shares go to him; 10 to Mr. Whitton, and on the same day 40 to Mr. Whitton; on the 25th, the next date, there are 50 to Mr. Whitton; on the 26th, 50 to Mr. Whitton; on the 27th, 50 and 5 to Mr. Whitton; on the 28th, 20 to Mr. Whitton; on the 30th, 50 and 10 to Mr. Whitton; on the 31st, 25 to Mr. Huckvale, and 10 to Mr. Huckvale.

19108. Is that all?—Yes.

19109. Am I to understand the name of Jones does not occur in that month?—Not at all; I will just look through again; no, none.

19110. Have you no means of telling us to whom Mr. Whitton sold those shares?—None at all.

19111. You say this was a joint transaction; was it no matter of inquiry with you how Mr. Whitton had disposed of your property, when you speak of those sales which are only nominal sales?—Nominal sales; I did not sell them myself, they were sold to Mr. Whitton.

19112. And that is the way the account is made up?—Yes.

19113. You handed over certain shares to Mr. Whitton?—Yes, at a certain price, but which he paid me for regularly at the time.

19114. That

19114. That was the mode of transacting the business?—Yes; Mr. Whitton sells 100 shares at such a price, and I sell him 100 shares at that price; it is a *bonâ fide* transaction between him and me.

19115. Did any money pass at that time?—Not at that time, but when we balanced our accounts.

19116. When you balanced your accounts, Mr. Whitton was answerable to you for the price at which he sold them?—Yes, at the price I sold them to him, which was the price he sold to the other party.

19117. Supposing, on the 18th of January, Mr. Whitton sold 100 shares at one discount to the other party, you would sell 100 shares at one discount to him?—Yes.

19118. And when you made up your accounts there would be that matter between you?—Yes, he would have to pay me.

19119. This appears to be a very large amount of shares, 2,134; cannot you give me the names of the parties from whom you got those shares?—Yes, certainly.

19120. For instance, on the 18th is there an entry of 300 shares sold by you to Mr. Huckvale?—I can give you this very likely; I have only got them, "Bought 300 of Mr. Huckvale, and sold 300 to Mr. Huckvale at a different price."

19121. In the course of that day?—Yes; some transaction as to the balance of the account; I have got 300 bought of him and 300 sold to him.

19122. Which was antecedent in time; was the sale to Mr. Huckvale after the buying of him?—That I cannot say.

19123. Cannot you tell that in the order of your account?—No; you cannot do it; it is impossible; I may have sold 10 less bargains than I bought, and I have got less on this side than on the other.

19124. Look at the 16th, you will find 200 sold on that day without any name to whom you sold; can you tell from whom you purchased that 200?—It was not either to Mr. Huckvale or Mr. Whitton.

19125. No; I know that.—Two hundred I bought of Mr. John Sutton, but that is no relation of the other Suttons.

19126. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Did you buy them of Mr. Sutton?—Yes.

19127. Mr. *Rowe.*] On the 17th, I see 150 shares sold to Mr. Whitton on that day; can you tell me of whom you purchased them?—I had better read you over my day's work.

19128. No; satisfy yourself from your book?—On the 17th I bought of different parties; I have got 10 bought of Mr. Hankey, 5 of Mr. Lyon, 119 of Huckvale, 50 of Whitton, 50 of Woolfe, 50 of E. H. Brown, 30 of Whitton. I have got no account of 150 on that day.

19129. Mr. *Alexander.*] Do you mean to say you bought them of those different persons? Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

19130. Let us make a distinction between those Suttons; when you speak of Suttons & Co., you mean Sutton, Sons & Gribble?—Yes.

19131. Are they not very extensive brokers at the Stock Exchange?—One of the principal houses.

19132. Dealers in the foreign and English funds, as well as in shares?—Yes.

19133. And the other Sutton is John Sutton, having no connexion with them?—None that I know of, and I have known them both for many years.

19134. You say on the 5th of January; just turn to your jobbing-book; on that day you say you bought 90 shares from Sutton's house?—Yes.

19135. And that you believed they were old shares?—I do not know; I think they were; and I have got 20 marked new just after.

19136. Looking at the price of those, would not the price lead you to suppose, there being but one-eighth difference, that they were new shares, as well as the 20 that follow them?—No; that need not be so, because frequently there was not one-eighth difference, and sometimes I have known the old shares liked the best.

19137. Was not that after the limit expired?—Yes, it was after the last day of payment.

Mr. *Edward Frith.*

19 May 1837.

19138. Am I to take it thus, that you are not sure whether the 90 are old or new?—No; there is one-eighth per cent. difference in the prices, but that takes place in a second very often.

19139. Now, seeing that the price is so nearly the same, are you still unable to say whether they were old or new?—Yes; that would not be a sufficient criterion to go by.

19140. Look to the 2d of December, when you say you bought 50 new Rennie's; is it not your belief that those shares were bought of Mr. John Sutton?—I have nothing like belief to go upon.

19141. Is it not stated, "Bought of Sutton," when your other entries mention Sutton & Co.?—Yes.

19142. Does not that circumstance lead you to believe it was made of Mr. John Sutton?—It is altogether impossible for me to say; I cannot tell.

19143. Are not all the other items, where you bought of Sutton, marked Sutton & Co.?—It is no certain rule; you have often not two minutes or a second to put down the name; you must scratch down some name.

19144. When there are two similar names among the dealers, do you not make a distinction by adding the Co.?—You generally make a distinction if you are not in a hurry of business; but you may put down only the name sometimes.

19145. Now were not those shares that were bought from Messrs. Sutton & Co., bought at the fair market price of the day?—Certainly; I have no doubt they were; it was a regular business transaction.

19146. Between two brokers of the Stock Exchange?—Between a broker and a jobber.

19147. Sutton & Co. being the brokers and you the jobber?—Yes.

19148. Does not the price charged in the book correspond with the prices they bore in the market?—I have no doubt you would see both prices marked in Wettenhall's list.

19149. You say many people would buy old Rennie's after the time was expired, from an impression that the company could not refuse to exchange them; was that impression general, that they could not refuse to exchange, the deposit being paid?—Yes, I have heard that expressed by some people. The price was so low a man did not mind entering into the speculation, buying 200 or 300 shares, and giving 5 *s.* for them. If he could not exchange them he would put them in the fire, and he knew his loss. I knew a good many people with whom that impression existed.

19150. That was subsequent to the expiration of the limit?—They could not do it then, but they could do it up to that time, because they thought the company could not refuse it. The companies named a certain day for the paying up the instalments, and they had almost invariably departed from it, and under those circumstances it was more worth a man's while when the shares were 5 *s.* than when they were 25 *s.*

19151. Did that impression exist among different people?—Yes.

19152. That was subsequent to the expiry of the limits?—Yes.

19153. Was not that the impression *à fortiori* before that, that the company could not refuse the new scrip when claimed, upon the payment of the deposit?—There was no doubt of that.

[The Witness withdrew.

Sabbati, 20° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. Charles Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq. IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Edward Northcote*, was called in; and Examined as follows:

19154. Mr. *Austin.*] WHERE do you live?—45, Old Change.

19155. Are you a subscriber to Rennie's Brighton line?—No.

19156. You are not?—No.

19157. Did you sign the deed?—Yes.

19158. That is what I mean; a subscriber is a person who signs a deed; you did sign the deed?—Yes.

19159. When?—I do not exactly recollect the time.

19160. About when?—I signed it in a court in Cheapside, not in Bridge-street, but at the other place.

19161. At the Poultry?—Yes.

19162. About what time was it, was it last year?—Perhaps it was; I have not thought of the matter since; I do not recollect the time.

19163. Or was it this year?—I do not recollect.

19164. How long ago was it?—It might be four months ago.

19165. How much did you sign for?—Twenty shares.

19166. Were you of age at that time?—No.

19167. Are you of age now?—No.

19168. How old were you then?—I was approaching to 20.

19169. Nineteen, and approaching 20?—Yes.

19170. Did you pay the deposit?—I paid it a short time after.

19171. What did you carry with you when you signed the deed, what did you take to the office?—I took some—I do not know what they call them; some papers; they were printed.

19172. What colour were they?—White.

19173. You took them to the office?—Yes.

19174. Who did you see at the office?—I saw one or two clerks, and I saw Mr. Dean.

19175. What did you say to Mr. Dean; you had got the papers in your pocket, and you had a conversation with Mr. Dean I suppose?—No, I told him I had signed it, and promised to pay the deposit a short time after, and he gave me just a receipt.

19176. Did you show him your shares?—I showed him those papers.

19177. What did you do with the papers?—I left them with him.

19178. And he gave you permission to sign upon the terms of your paying some time afterwards?—Yes.

19179. Will you be so good as to recollect; you had some conversation with Mr. Dean?—No, I had no conversation with him, he just gave me a receipt.

19180. You spoke to him and showed him the scrip?—(*The Witness hesitated.*)

19181. *Committee.*] Tell us what passed between you and Mr. Dean about those white shares, what was said or done?—There was nothing done particularly; I signed two or three books.

19182. What were the books you signed; when you went into the room, you took the white papers; tell us all that passed?—I had a receipt from Mr. Dean,

Mr. E. Northcote.

20 May 1837.

Dean, and a day or two after I paid the deposit at Bridge-street and got the blue papers; I do not know the name of them.

19183. Mr. *Austin.*] I want a little more detail; you had some conversation with Mr. Dean, had you not?—No, I had not any conversation with him.

19184. Did he say anything to you?—No.

19185. Did he not utter any words at all?—He might say two or three words.

19186. Just attend and tell us what the words were?—I cannot tell you.

19187. Did you tell him how old you were?—No.

19188. You produced the papers, did you sign the deed?—Yes, I went to sign for my father.

19189. Did you produce the papers to Mr. Dean?—Yes.

19190. Did you tell him you came to sign for yourself or your father or anybody else, or did you tell him anything at all?—I told him I came to sign for my father.

19191. What did he say to that?—He said if I paid the deposit a day or two afterwards it would do, as my father was not in town then.

19192. Did you say so, or did Mr. Dean say so?—Mr. Dean said so.

(*The last two questions and answers were read to the Witness.*)

19193. Is that correct?—I told Mr. Dean my father was not in town, and I came to sign for him.

12194. What observation did Mr. Dean make upon that?—I can hardly recollect all these things, I never thought of the affair since I signed.

19195. But cannot you recollect what Mr. Dean said when you told him your father was not in town?—He gave me a receipt for this scrip, and I paid the deposit a short time after.

19196. Did he tell you that?—He gave me the receipt, and I told him I would pay the deposit a short time after.

19197. What did he say to that?—He agreed to it.

19198. Did you thereupon sign the deed?—Yes.

19199 Did you sign in your own name?—Yes.

19200. *Chairman.*] Did Mr. Dean make any objection to your signing instead of your father?—No.

19201. Mr. *Austin.*] He did not?—No.

19202. Who went and got the blue scrip, you or your father?—I did.

19203. And you paid the money?—No, I did not.

19204. Who did pay the money?—I paid the money at the place.

19205. To whom did you pay it?—To Mr. Dean.

19206. In money, or a check?—I think they were country notes; yes, they were.

19207. Who was in the room when you paid?—When I paid it to Mr. Dean?

19208. Yes. Did I understand you paid in Bridge-street?—Yes.

19209. Who was in the room besides yourself and Mr. Dean when you paid?—There was another gentleman; I do not know whether he was a subscriber or belonging to the office.

19210. What were you at that time?—I am in the lace trade now, and was at that time.

19211. Do you carry it on on your own account?—No, I am with my father.

19212. In what capacity, are you a partner with your father, or as clerk?—I am not exactly a partner.

19213. Were you helping him in his business?—Yes.

19214. Learning the business?—Yes; living with him, and learning the business.

19215. Where were you living at that time?—45, Old Change.

19216. How did you describe yourself in the deed; as warehouseman?—Yes.

19217. *Chairman.*] Is that your father's description in business, a warehouseman?—Yes.

19218. Mr. *Austin.*] What room was it you went into in the Poultry, when you saw Mr. Dean there?—It was down on the ground floor.

19219. On the right hand or the left?—Where I went in it was on the right hand, and I signed in the room on the left; it was arranged as an office; one was the office, and the other was Mr. Dean's private office.

29220. Which did you go into, or did you go into both?—I went into both.

19221. Where

19221. Where did you make the arrangement with Mr. Dean as to coming again?—In his own room.

19222. Was he alone then?—No, there were two subscribers there; two gentlemen subscribers.

19223. What do you mean by subscribers?—They had shares in the railway.

19224. Do you mean that they had shares in that railway?—Yes, I do not know who they were; they went out before I did; I left one of them there, and one went out before I did.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

19225. What is your present age?—I am between 19 and 20

19226. Your father is a warehouseman carrying on business at 45, in the Old Change?—Yes.

19227. How long has he been established there?—About five years there; but he lived in Holborn before.

19228. Is he in the wholesale business, or retail?—In the wholesale.

19229. Does he carry on a considerable business, or a small business?—A small business.

19230. Is your father able to pay the calls upon 20 shares in this company, when they are called for from time to time?—I do not know that he is; I do not know to what amount it is.

19231. Has your father any property of his own?—Yes, he has.

19232. As you say you signed it for your father, and you say he was out of town, how long had he been out of town?—A day or two; he was coming home in about a week afterwards.

19233. You cannot tell me the day you signed the deed?—No, I really forget all about it; I thought so little about it.

19234. Has your father the blue shares now?—No, he sold them; he has nothing to do with it.

19235. Do you know when he sold them?—No; about two months ago; some considerable time ago.

19236. Do you know how long he had had the white scrip?—No, I do not.

19237. Nor of whom he bought it?—No.

19238. Do you know anything about the time at which you signed it, whether it was at the period of the advertisement that the limit would expire for the payment of the deposits?—No; I knew nothing about the advertisement at all.

19239. Was it at your father's request you went there?—Yes.

19240. You told Mr. Dean your father was in the country at the time?—Yes.

19241. And you paid country notes for the amount of 20*l.* at that time?—Some time afterwards.

19242. A day or two afterwards?—Yes; it was to prevent his losing the shares.

19243. Did you know or did your father tell you, if the shares were not signed for during the period he was out of town, he would lose the benefit of the shares?—I did not know it till a day or two ago, or this morning rather; I asked him, and he told me he paid the 20*l.* to prevent him losing the shares; it was the deposit I believe.

19244 And until you paid the 20*l.* you did not get the blue scrip?—No.

19245. You exchanged the white scrip and did not take up the blue which remained, as a security for the 20*l.* deposit, and as soon as you paid the deposit you had the blue scrip?—Yes.

19246. You did not get any blue scrip till you paid the 20*l.*—No.

19247. Did you know Mr. Dean before this time?—No, not at all.

19248. You told my learned friend, you told Mr. Dean you were signing for your father; are you sure you said that?—Yes.

19249. Do you know whether your father had been a holder of the white scrip under the old deed?—No, I do not; I had not been in town a long time before I signed it.

19250. Who came to you about your coming here to give evidence?—I did not see the person that came.

19251. When was it there was a summons left?—There was a man came a day or two before, and I was out.

19252. You do not know who it was?—No.

19253. Did you see any one upon the subject before the summons was received?—No, I did not.

19254. You say you did not tell Mr. Dean you were under age, can you tell how

Mr. *E. Northcote.*
20 May 1837.

how the man that came to you knew it, if he did know it?—There was a brother of mine there, and he asked him if I was under age.

19255. He came to fish and make out those enquiries?—Yes; I do not know what he meant, he asked my brother if I was his age.

19256. Mr. *Austin.*] Your brother's age?—No, the young man's age.

19257. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you know to whom your father sold the shares?—No.

19258. You do not know of whom he purchased or to whom he sold them?—No.

19259. Has your father any shares in any other companies?—No, he will not have anything more to do with them.

19260. Has he had any shares in any other companies?—Only one, I think; is the Westminster and Deptford, something of that sort.

Re-examined by Mr. *Austin.*

19261. Do I understand that you paid the money in Bridge-street, Westminster?—Yes.

19262. About how long was it that you paid the money, after you had left the scrip?—Three weeks, perhaps about that.

19263. I thought you told me just now two or three days?—No, I did not.

19264. If you did it was a mistake?—Yes; it was some time afterwards.

19265. Was your father returned from the country then?—Yes.

19266. And was at home when you went to get the blue scrip?—Yes.

19267. When you got the blue scrip, did you give it to your father?—Yes.

19268. The same day?—Yes.

19269. When you returned home?—Yes.

19270. Did you tell your father you had signed the deed?—Yes.

19271. Did he know it when you went to get the blue scrip?—Yes.

19272. You had told him that before?—Yes.

19273. He did not go with you?—No.

19274. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Is that the receipt (*handing a paper to the Witness*)?—Yes.

[The Witness withdrew.

Archibald Freeman, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Arch. Freeman.

19275–6. Mr. *Austin.* DID you sign Rennie's subscription deed?—Yes.

19277. At what time?—I should think about November last; I am not certain as to the time.

19278. Whom did you see when you signed it?—That I cannot tell; I should think it was one of the Mr. Hankeys.

19279. Did you go to Messrs. Hankeys' to sign it?—Yes.

19280. What were you at that time?—Clerk to my present employer.

19281. *Chairman.*] Who is your present employer?—Messrs. Dawson, of Billiter-square.

19282. What are they?—Ship-owners.

19283. You were a clerk, receiving a salary?—Yes.

19284. What was the amount of that salary at that time?—Eighty pounds a year.

19285. Any other emoluments attached to the office?—Nothing whatever.

19286. Mr. *Austin.*] How old were you at that time?—Twenty.

19287. Where did you get the certificates when you went to sign the deed; I presume you carried certificates?—Yes, I carried them.

19288. Do you recollect or not?—I took two papers that belonged to Mr. James Dawson; I took them for him.

19289. Did you take those papers to Messrs. Hankeys'?—Yes.

19290. And any money?—Ten pounds.

19291. When you got there, what did you do with your papers and your money?—I paid the 10*l.* upon them, and I think they gave me a receipt for it.

19292. Did you sign the deed there?—Yes.

19293. Did you tell the parties at the time that you signed, not for yourself, but some other person?—No; I made no remark whatever.

19294. What did you do with the receipt?—Whatever I got back I gave to Mr. James Dawson.

19295. Did

19295. Did you do anything more in the matter yourself?—Nothing whatever. *Arch. Freeman.*

19296. What became of the receipt; whether you gave it to Messrs. Dawson you do not know?—No. 20 May 1837.

19297. Just look at that (*handing a paper to the Witness*); did you get a paper like that?—I think I did.

19298. And that paper you gave to Mr. Dawson?—Yes.

19299. How did you describe yourself in the deed?—9, Billiter-square.

19300. Gentleman?—Yes.

19301. At whose request did you take those certificates and sign the deed?—Mr. James Dawson.

19302. What were his instructions to you, or his request?—He said very nearly these words: I wish you would take this to Messrs. Hankeys' and sign your name to the deed and pay 10 *l.*

19303. Did he say his name, or your name?—My name; he did not wish his name to appear, he being acquainted with Messrs. Hankeys, for so small a sum. He is intimate with them.

19304. And you signed accordingly?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

19305. Mr. Dawson is one of the firm of Dawson & Co.?—No; the firm is John and Thomas Dawson; and James is the son of Thomas.

19306. Is he one of your employers?—No; he comes there occasionally.

19307. What business is he in?—Ship-biscuit baker.

19308. He is in that business on his own account?—Yes.

19309. Is 9, Billiter-square, the place where their counting-house is?—Yes.

19310. Is he in a large way of business as a biscuit-baker?—Yes, very large; he has been established in business three or four years, and has a very excellent business.

19311. He gave you the shares?—Yes, to take to Messrs. Hankeys' and pay the 10 *l.*, not wishing his name to appear for so small a sum.

19312. Are they his bankers?—No.

19313. Mr. *Austin.*] Seven hundred and fifty pounds?—Yes.

19314. Mr. *Alexander.*] He is a gentleman well able to pay 750 *l.*?—I should think so.

Re-examined by Mr. *Austin.*

19315. Then Mr. James Dawson is no master of yours?—No.

19316. You simply know him from coming to the same place where you are?—Yes, for so many years.

[The Witness withdrew.

John Jackson, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

19317. Mr. *Austin.*]—Where do you live?—14, Dorset-crescent, New North-road. *John Jackson.*

19318. Have you been served with an order to attend this committee?—I have.

19319. When?—I think it was the first day.

19320. Did you sign Rennie's subscription list?—I did.

19321. When?—That I cannot say exactly.

12322. This year or last year?—I should think it was about last December or January, I am not sure.

19323. Whereabout did you sign it?—Messrs. Hankeys', the bankers.

19324. Did you take certificates at the time you signed the deed?—I took a certificate, I think.

19325. Certificates or a certificate?—I think it was a certificate.

19326. For how many shares was it?—Twenty shares.

19327. Was it a white one?—Really I cannot say.

10328. You do not recollect?—No, but I can show you the shares that I took with me to pay upon, (*producing some papers*).

19329. Let me look at them?—Here they are (*handing them to Mr. Austin*), they have never been exchanged.

19330. Three for five each, and five for one, making twenty?—Yes.

19331. Do I understand you that those papers were in your possession at the

John Jackson.

20 May 1837.

time you went to sign the deed?—I have no doubt of it, they did not belong to me.

19332. Be so good as to attend to my questions; I did not ask you to whom they belonged; were those shares in your possession at the time you went to the bankers'?—I have no doubt of it.

19333. But you say you think it was in the month of December?—I think it was.

19334. When you got to the bankers' with those shares in your possession, what did you do?—I went to make a payment upon them, and they directed me to the inner office.

19335. Where did you go to; what street was it?—Fenchurch-street.

19336. Did you go to the inner office?—Yes.

19337. What took place there?—I paid 20 *l.*

19338. Is that all you did?—I signed the deed.

19339. As of 14, Dorset-crescent, gentleman?—Yes.

19340. Did you bring the certificates away with you again?—Yes, of course I did.

19341. Did you or did you not?—I did.

19342. Did you get a receipt?—I did.

19343. What did you do with the receipt afterwards?—Gave it to the party whom it belonged to.

19344. Is that all you did with it?—Yes.

19345. Have you ever obtained any new certificates upon that receipt?—No.

19346. Your knowledge of the transaction ends with the giving the receipt to the person to whom it belonged?—Decidedly.

19347. You still hold those receipts in your possession?—No.

19348. What did you do with them?—Gave them up to the party they belonged to.

19349. How soon was that after you signed the deed?—Perhaps 10 minutes or a quarter of an hour.

19350. Who was the party to whom those certificates belonged?—To Mr. Henry Parker.

19351. Who is he?—A member of the Stock Exchange.

19352. A stock-broker?—No, I believe he is a jobber.

19353. Who introduced you to Mr. Parker?—I have known him these 20 years.

19354. How came you to effect this transaction for him?—He asked me to do it; to go and make the payment.

19355. How long was it before you went to the bankers' he made that request to you?—Not five minutes.

19356. Then do I understand you to say you saw him in the course of the day, when you went to the bankers'?—Yes.

19357. By accident or by appointment?—Perchance.

19358. Where?—In Capel-court.

19359. Near the Stock Exchange?—One of the entrances to it.

19360. When you saw him in Capel-court did he make that proposal to you?—He asked me if I would go and make the payment for him.

19361. Did he ask you to sign the deed for him?—I did not know there was a deed to sign.

19362. He asked you to make the payment only?—Yes.

19363. Have you signed deeds for any other companies?—Yes.

19364. You did not know there was a deed to sign here?—I did not give it a thought.

19365. You took the money and went to the bankers'?—Yes.

19366. How came you to sign the deed?—I was told it was necessary.

19367. Who told you it was necessary?—The party to whom I paid the money.

19368. Did you, or did you not, at the time you found it was necessary to sign the deed, tell him that the certificates were not your own, and that they belonged to Mr. Parker?—I did not.

19369. Did you sign the deed in your own name, for Mr. Parker?—No, I signed in my own name.

19370. Do you mean to state to the Committee you had any authority to sign the deed in your own name, for Mr. Parker?—I do not understand the question.

19371. Had you any authority from Mr. Parker to sign the deed in your own name?—I had not, I went to make the payment.

19372. Did

19372. Did Mr. Parker go with you?—I really do not know whether he did or not.

19373. You mean to say you do not know whether you left him in Capel-court, or whether he went down to Fenchurch-street with you?—I do not recollect it.

19374. Where did you see him again after you got the receipt?—I should think in Capel-court, or in the neighbourhood of the Stock Exchange.

19375. That was within 10 minutes after you had signed the deed?—I think it must be.

19376. When you saw him again in 10 minutes, did you tell him you had signed the deed?—Yes.

19377. Did you tell him of the manner you had done it, that you had signed it in your own name?—I told him I had signed it in my own name.

19378. Did he make any remark to you upon it?—I am not aware that he made any.

19379. Within 10 minutes of the time you got the receipt, he knew you had signed the deed in your own name?—I have no doubt of it.

19380. Did you at that time give him the white papers?—Of course I did.

19381. How long have those white papers been in your possession now?—Since yesterday morning.

19382. Were they in your possession on the first day of this Committee meeting?—No.

19383. How came you to get possession of them?—I sent for them.

19384. To whom?—To Mr. Parker.

19385. Did you go or send?—I sent.

19386. Did you send a note?—Yes.

19387. And you got these in return?—Yes.

19388. Have you not seen Mr. Parker about it?—No, not since.

19389. Since when?—Since I had these receipts.

19390. Since the time when you gave those white papers to Mr. Parker, and yesterday morning, you have never seen them?—No.

19391. What has been done with them in the mean time, you do not know?—Of course not.

19392. Only answer the question?—I do not.

19393. Did you sign the South Midland deed?—I did.

19394. For how many shares?—I have forgotten them.

19395. Perhaps I can help you, was it for 310 shares?—Yes, I think it was.

19396. Representing 15,000*l.*?—I believe so.

19397. Did you sign the London and Grand Junction?—Yes, I did.

19398. What other?—I cannot recollect.

19399. Did you incur a liability thereby to the amount of 2,000*l.*?—Very likely.

19400. Did you sign the Westminster Bridge and Deptford?—Yes.

19401. What was the liability you incurred by that signature?—I did not consider there was any liability at all; I never considered there was any liability.

19402. You know what I mean, when I ask you the amount of your liability?—As I stated before, I never thought there was any liability attached to signing any of these deeds.

19403. My question is this; do you know what I mean when I ask you the amount of the liability?—Yes, I do.

19404. What was the amount of the liability you incurred by signing the West minster Bridge and Deptford deed?—I do not know.

19405. Was it 3,000*l.*?—I do not know, it might be, but I cannot tell.

19406. Did you sign the City and Richmond deed?—It is very likely.

19407. Have you any doubt about it?—I really cannot recollect, it is very likely I did.

19408. Did you sign it to the amount of 5,000*l.*?—I might have done it, but I do not recollect.

19409. Did you sign the South Eastern and the Dover deed?—Yes.

19410. That you do remember?—I think I did.

19411. Have you any doubt of it?—I think I did.

19412. What was the amount of the liability there?—I do not know.

19413. Let me assist you, 9,750*l.*?—Very likely, I do not know to the contrary.

19414. Did you sign the South Western?—Yes.

John Jackson.

20 May 1837.

19415. How much?—I really do not recollect.

19416. Five thousand pounds?—Very likely.

19417. Is it not true you have signed, independently of this deed, deeds to the amount of 41,750 *l.*?—Very likely.

19418. Probably a great deal more?—I really cannot say whether I have or not.

19419. In what years have you signed all those deeds?—I should think in the last 12 months.

19420. Any of them this year?—I really cannot say; I am not sure whether I have or have not.

19421. Do you remember, at the time you signed the Westminster Bridge and Deptford deed, whether you signed for yourself or anybody else?—I think it was for myself.

19422. Were you paid nothing for signing that deed?—There was one I was paid 10*s.* for; I think it was the Westminster Bridge.

19423. Were you paid anything for signing the Brighton deed?—Nothing at all.

19424. By Mr. Parker?—Not a halfpenny.

19425. What was the consideration for signing for Mr. Parker?—Not a halfpenny.

19426. For friendship?—Yes.

19427. *Chairman.*] Had you a promise of anything?—Not anything.

19428. Mr. *Austin.*] Have you been in the habit of doing business for him?—Yes, formerly.

19429. What sort of business?—Connected with the Stock Exchange.

19430. You say you have known Mr. Parker 20 years?—Yes, I think I have.

19430*. Pretty well?—Yes.

19431. He had known you pretty intimately?—Yes.

19432. He was not ignorant of the state of your finances?—It is very likely.

19433. Have you any doubt that he knew the state of your finances at that time?—Really it is impossible for me to say; I dare say he might know that I was badly off.

19434. Have you any doubt he knew it?—Really it is impossible for me to say.

19435. When did you take the benefit of the Insolvent Act?—Some years ago.

19436. You have known Mr. Parker since that time?—Yes.

19437. I suppose he was not ignorant of that fact?—That I cannot say; it was eight or nine years ago.

19438. Have you done business with him since?—I think I have.

19439. Where do you live now?—The same place as I did before.

19440. Are you a housekeeper?—I have a furnished house.

19441. Is it a furnished house or lodgings?—A furnished house.

19442. What are you?—A stock-jobber.

19443. You are still a stock-jobber?—Yes, and have always been.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

19444. Then it appears to me, as far as I can gather from your evidence, you have signed deeds that have obtained their Acts, such as the London Grand Junction; and have you signed other deeds that have not got so far yet?—I have.

19445. There was no kind gentleman investigating, on the part of the public, into the London and Grand Junction?—No, there was not.

19446. Is Mr. Parker a gentleman of substance?—I believe so.

19447. Did you receive those white scrips back from Mr. Parker for the purpose of producing when examined?—I did.

19448. Now, as you are a stock-jobber, and have been connected with that establishment for some time, do you know a gentleman of the name of Daniel Edward Stephens, who is a petitioner here?—Yes, I know him.

19449. On the 24th of last April did Daniel Edward Stephens come to you, or meet you anywhere?—Yes, he did.

19450. That was the day of the presentation of Till's petition; did he treat you with some ale in a public-house?—He did.

19451. Did he ask you if you knew you had signed Rennie's Brighton for 20 shares?—He did so.

19452. Did he tell you he knew at that time that money would be of service to you?—Yes, I did.

19453. The fact was that money would be of service to you, I suppose, at that time?—It would.

19454. Having told you he knew that money would be an object to you, did he produce to you a petition ready cut and dried?—He did.

19455. Did he wish you to sign it?—He did.

19456. Did he tell you who had drawn it up?—Yes, he did.

19457. What was the name of the person?—Thomas Green.

19458. Was there a blank in the petition you had to fill up with the name of the person for whom you signed?—Yes.

19459. Was there an allegation in the petition that you received from that person a sum of money for signing it?—Yes, there was.

19460. Was the sum left in blank for you to fill up?—Yes, it was.

19461. Did you upon that occasion tell Mr. Stephens that you had received nothing for signing the deed?—Yes, I did.

19462. Did he ask you whether you recollected at the time the name of the gentleman for whom you signed the deed?—Yes, he did; and I told him I did not recollect the name.

19463. Did you recollect it?—I did not.

19464. What did he say to you upon your so telling him you did not recollect the name of the person?—"Put in any name."

19465. Did he say anything more besides "put in any name?"—I told him I knew no name I could put in.

19466. What did he say to that?—He said, "Do you know anybody who is dead lately, put in his name, and it can never be disproved."

19467. Did Mr. Stephens say anything more to you; you say there was a blank left, one of the allegations being that you had received a sum of money from the person for whom you signed, and you were to put in the sum; did he say anything to you as to that blank?—He said, put in any amount, 5 *s.*, 10 *l.* or 1 *l.*

19468. What did you say to Mr. Stephens upon that?—I gave him the petition back, and said I would have nothing to do with it.

19469. Did you make any observations upon Mr. Stephens's conduct in bringing it to you?—I told him I thought it was very wrong.

19470. Did you then separate?—We did.

19471. On the 27th of the month of April, did you again see Mr. Stephens in this neighbourhood?—I did.

19472. Did he say anything to you on that occasion?—He said a gentleman connected with Mr. Stephenson's line wished to see me.

19473. Did he ask you to go anywhere with him?—Yes.

19474. Where did he ask you to go to?—To the office of Mr. Stephenson's line, in Palace-yard.

19475. Did you consent to go?—Yes.

19476. Did you go?—Yes, I did.

19477. Did Mr. Stephens go with you?—He did.

19478. When you got there, did you go into any room?—I went into the back office.

19379. Were there persons assembled there?—Yes, three or four individuals.

19480. There you saw very many persons, did you?—There were three or four there.

19481. After you had seen and conversed with the gentlemen, did you cross over to the other side to avoid the rain?—I did.

19482. After you had so done, did Mr. Stephens came again to you?—He did.

19483. What did Mr. Stephens say to you when he came back?—He said, "How hasty you were," because I would not answer the questions put to me.

19484. Had you had some questions put to you by the gentlemen there, you declined to answer?—Yes, I had.

19485. After he said, how hasty you were, did he say anything else?—He said, "what a damned fool you are, that you could not put money into your pocket."

Re-examined by Mr. *Austin.*

19486. Pray sir, to whom did you tell this long story, that my learned friend has been asking you out of his brief?—I went to Rennie's office.

John Jackson.

20 May 1837.

19487. What day did you go there?—I think it was about the 3d or 4th of May.

19488. Who did you see?—I saw Mr. Till, at Rennie's office; I think his name is Till.

19489. Mr. Till is Sweet & Sutton's clerk, is not he?—I do not know.

19490. Is not that the person (*pointing to Mr. Till*)?—Yes, that is he.

19491. Did you tell this story to him?—Yes.

19492. Did he take it down in writing?—Yes.

19493. Had you not constantly refused before, to give any information to any persons on the other side?—I had never been spoken to upon this subject.

19494. Had you not been spoken to respecting the scrip, and signing the deed, and the whole of the transaction?—Yes.

19495. Have you not refused to give any information to the persons who asked you?—Yes, of course I did.

19496. Did you not constantly refuse to give information to those persons respecting the transaction?—To be sure.

19497. Have you not been in constant correspondence with the persons on the other side, from the time you were served with the chairman's warrant to the present hour?—No.

19498. How often have you been there?—Half-a-dozen times.

19499. Whom have you seen there?—Mr. Till and Mr. Sutton.

19500. Whom else have you seen there?—I do not know the names.

19501. Have you seen Mr. Dean?—I do not know him.

19502. How many other persons have you seen besides Mr. Till and Mr. Sutton?—Five or six.

19503. Directors?—I do not know.

19504. Persons managing the company?—Yes, perhaps so.

19505. Have you not told this story to them?—Not to all of them.

19506. To how many?—One or two.

19507. Do you know Mr. Robert Sutton, a gentleman on the Stock Exchange?—I know him by sight.

19508. Did you happen to see him there?—He was there.

19509. He was one of the six persons you saw at the office?—He might have been.

19510. You say he was there; where was he?—In the office.

19511. When did you first see Mr. Till, or any other person connected with the other side?—I think about the 3d or 4th of May.

19512. When did you first come to this committee-room?—The first day.

19513. Did you come the second day?—Yes.

19514. Did you see any of them then?—I might have seen them passing and re-passing.

19515. It was not till the 4th of May, you made this statement?—The 3d or 4th of May.

19516. How long had you been in attendance upon this Committee, when you made that statement to Mr. Till?—The Committee was not in existence.

19517. Had you made that statement before the 10th of May?—Yes, I think it was on the fourth.

19518. Is it from the 4th of May you date those five or six visits you have made to that office?—Yes.

19519. Have you been paid for attending this Committee?—Not a halfpenny.

19520. Have you received any money from Mr. Till?—Not a halfpenny.

19521. Or promise of any money?—Nor promise.

19522. Where had you been living during this time?—Living; I have been dining at different places of course.

19523. Is that your answer?—Yes.

19524. What places have you been dining at?—I dined once or twice at the King's Arms.

19525. Who paid for your dinner?—Mr. Jones.

19526. Who is Mr. Jones?—Really, I do not know.

19527. Is Mr. Jones a gentleman connected with Sir John Rennie's line?—I believe he is; I do not know.

19528. Is his name George Jones?—Yes.

19529. Is he a member of the Stock Exchange?—I do not think he ever was a member.

19530. Who

19530. George Jones paid for your dinner on those occasions; where else did you dine?—I do not know the names of the places.

19531. Be so good as to recollect, your memory is very active about Mr. Stephens; I intend to make it as active about these other gentlemen?—I have no objection.

19532. Where did you dine besides?—I do not know the name of the place.

19533. Did Mr. Jones pay for your dinner there?—Yes.

19534. Did he pay for you only once?—Yes, at that house.

19535. That makes three; where else have you been dining?—I am sure I do not know.

19536. Who has paid for your dinner on those occasions when you do not know where you have been dining?—We have been only to two houses.

19537. How many dinners have you had together?—Four or five.

19538. Who paid for those dinners?—Mr. Jones.

19539. Did you and Mr. Jones dine together *tete-à-tete*, or were there others present?—Mr. Carr was one.

19540. Who is Mr. Carr?—He belongs to the Stock Exchange.

19541. Is his name Samuel?—Yes.

19542. Did Mr. Till ever happen to dine with you?—Never.

19543. Was that after Mr. Till wrote down this long story?—It is since I have been summoned upon this Committee.

19544. Did Mr. Jones pay for Mr. Carr's dinner?—I rather think he did, but I cannot say.

19545. May I take it as a matter you have no doubt of, is it so?—I have no doubt he did.

19546. Now, as we have got as far as Mr. Jones and Mr. Carr, tell me the other gentlemen that dined with you; we will have the whole party if you please; you can recollect them?—There were four or five I knew.

19547. Now if you please to give me their names?—Mr. Cooke dined with us.

19548. Give me Mr. Cooke's christian name?—I really do not know his christian name.

19549. Was it the young Cooke, or the old one?—The elder one.

19550. Had that Cooke a son in gaol at that time?—I believe he had.

10551. Who paid for the dinner of the elder Cooke?—I believe Mr. Jones paid for all.

19552. We have got that, once for all?—I would have admitted that if you had asked me in the first instance.

19553. Which means, you have no doubt he paid for all?—I have stated that already.

19554. Have you any doubt of it?—None whatever.

19555. Now, give me the names of the other guests; we have got Cooke and Carr, we must have the others?—There was another person I have forgotten.

19556. That you persist in?—For the moment I have forgotten.

15957. Give me the names of some other guests?—I do not recollect any others.

19558. There were three others?—I do not recollect that there were any more.

19559. Be so good as to tell me the parties present upon that occasion, except the gentleman you do not recollect; yourself, Mr. Jones, Mr. Carr, Mr. Cooke, and the unknown person; who else?—I do not think there was anybody else.

19560. Did you not dine, day after day, with these people?—No, not every day.

19561. Pretty nearly every day?—They were not always there.

19562. But you were always there?—I have been there three or four times.

19563. Will you swear you have not dined there six times?—Yes.

19564. What is the precise number of times?—Either four or five.

19565. And not six?—I am sure it is not.

19566. Did Mr. Poulton happen to dine there?—No.

19567. Did he come in at any time?—Yes, he did.

19568. Is that gentleman's name Benjamin Wheeler Poulton?—I believe it is.

19569. You have no doubt of it?—None.

19570. I suppose

John Jackson.

20 May 1837.

19570. I suppose you had conversation at these convivial meetings, had you not?—The usual conversation.

19571. What was it about; was it about Rennie's line?—Very little about Rennie's line.

19572. Was there anything about Rennie's deed?—There was no occasion.

19573. Was there nothing about Rennie's deed?—No, nothing that I recollect.

19574. Did anything pass at any time about your transaction with Mr. Parker?—Certainly not.

19575. About Mr. Carr's business?—I believe that has been spoken about.

19576. Do you remember the day when Mr. Carr was examined before the Committee?—Yes.

19577. Do you mean to say you did not dine with Mr. Carr that day?—I do not recollect; I do not know the day he was examined.

19578. Do you recollect conversations taking place about the time that Mr. Carr was examined?—No, I do not.

19579. You told me you did remember his being examined?—Yes.

19580. Have you dined with him since that time or not?—I have.

19581. And Mr. Jones has dined with you?—Yes.

19582. And Mr. Cook?—Yes.

19583. Do you mean to state, you had no conversation at that time about Mr. Carr's evidence before this Committee?—I cannot state that we did or not, it is very likely we did.

16584. Do you mean to state solemnly before the Committee, that Mr. Carr's evidence was not discussed at that meeting?—It might have been spoken of.

19585. Have you any doubt of it?—Very likely; I think it was.

19586. Have you any doubt of it?—

19587. *Chairman.*] You must answer the question?—I have no doubt at all of it.

19588. Mr. *Austin.*] Do you recollect Mr. Cooke, the younger, being examined here?—I heard of it.

19589. Where did you hear of it?—Waiting in the passage.

19590. That was before some of these dinner parties took place, was not it?—I really do not remember whether it was before or since.

19591. You mean to state that?—Yes, I do.

19592. You say these dinners have been paid for; have you had nothing else paid for?—Nothing at all.

19593. Are you sure of that?—Yes, certain.

19594. Have you had any promise of any further payment?—Not a halfpenny.

19595. And you expect nothing more?—I expect you will pay me for the time you have brought me here.

19596. You expect nothing more from Rennie's people?—Not a farthing.

19597. Nor from Mr. Jones?—Not a farthing.

19598. I presume upon reflection, you mean to state, that what you have stated to the Committee about Mr. Stephens is true; is it true or false?—I am ready to verify it upon oath.

15999. Is it true or false?—It is true.

19600. That you state?—Yes.

19601. Is it true you had forgotten Mr. Parker's name upon the occasion when Mr. Stephens asked you?—I did not know who I had signed it for.

19602. Is it true you had forgotten Mr. Parker's name, upon the occasion when Mr. Stephens asked you?—I did not know who I had signed it for at that time.

19603. When?—When Mr. Stephens spoke of it.

19604. Is is true you had forgotten whom you signed for?—I did not recollect.

19605. You had signed it for Mr. Parker?—Yes.

19606. Did you not know it at the time you signed the deed?—Yes.

19607. At the time you signed the deed you knew you had signed for Mr. Parker?—Yes.

19608. Is it true or not true you had forgotten you had signed for Mr. Parker when Mr. Stephens asked you the question?—Yes, I had.

19609. That is what you mean, you had forgotten the fact of signing for Mr. Parker?—Yes.

19610. Are you ready to verify that by your oath?—Yes, I am.

19611. When

19611. When did it come back to your recollection you signed for Mr. Parker?—When I ascertained the fact where I signed the deed, then I recollected it.

19612. Where did you ascertain that?—At Rennie's office.

19613. How came you there?—I went to state the circumstance of Mr. Stephens having gone and had ale.

19614. When did you go to state that?—I think it was about the 3d or 4th of May.

19615. Was that after Mr. Stephens had called upon you the first time?—Yes.

19616. The second time?—Yes.

19617. How many times did he call upon you?—Twice.

19618. On two different days?—Monday and Thursday.

19619. Now, your memory is fortunately very accurate as to that; when did you go to Rennie's office, was it Thursday or Friday?—It was subsequently.

19620. You recollect Mr. Stephens coming to you on Monday and Thursday, what was the day of the week you went to Rennie's office?—On the Tuesday following, I think it was.

19621. Who did you see there?—Mr. Till.

19622. Who was the first person you mentioned this to?—To Mr. Till and to Mr. Sutton.

19623. Whom you saw there?—Yes.

19624. When was the first day you dined with Mr. Jones after this?—I think it was the day I was summoned by your party to attend here.

19625. How came you to see Mr. Jones that day?—I meet him every day.

19626. Had you met him every day before that?—Yes.

19627. Had you seen him on the Monday when Mr. Stephens called upon you?—It is impossible to say, I might have seen him.

19628. Had you seen him on the Thursday?—I might.

19629. Had you seen him before you saw Mr. Till and Mr. Sutton?—Not to speak to him on the subject.

19630. Had you seen him?—It is very likely.

19631. *Chairman.*] Had you or had you not?—It is very likely, I see him every day.

19632. Mr. *Austin.*] Where do you see him every day?—He is in this neighbourhood.

19633. How came you here in this neighbourhood?—I have been summoned here on different occasions.

19634. How came Mr. Jones to ask you to dine with him?—I cannot say.

19635. How came you to accept that invitation?—I do not know.

19636. Did you not think it rather odd you should meet Cook and Carr there?—Not at all.

19637. Nor at all odd that Mr. Jones should pay for your dinner?—No.

19638. The scrip delivered to you was the scrip you got from Mr. Parker?—Yes.

19639. It was out of your possession from the time you signed the deed until yesterday morning?—Yes, it was.

19640. Do you know where it came from?—From his house.

19641. Do you know where it had been during all that time?—I should suppose in his tin box.

19642. Do you know that?—There is the party that fetched them for me (*pointing to a person in the room*).

19643. What is the individual's name?—I do not know his name.

19644. How came you to send that person, the name of whom you do not know?—I knew him by sight.

19645. Who is he?—I do not know.

19646. Where did you see him?—I saw him in the City by accident the evening before.

10647. Is he connected with any of the parties to this transaction?—I do not know, I believe he is.

19648. With whom?— Mr. Jones, I believe he is.

19649. He was the person you selected to send for the certificates?—Of course.

19650. At whose suggestion did you send for these certificates; did anybody tell you to do it?—Nobody whatever.

John Jackson.

20 May 1837.

19651. Have you shown the scrip to anybody since you had it?—Yes.
19652. To whom?—I went over to the office yesterday and showed it.
19653. To what office?—Rennie's.
19654. Who did you show them to?—I do not know his name.
19655. Was he a person attending in the office?—He was sitting at the table.
19656. What room was it?—In the solicitor's room.
19657. Is that party in the room now, to whom you showed it?—I think that is the gentleman (*pointing to a gentleman of the name of Smith*), a clerk to Sweet and Sutton.
19658. How came you to show the certificates to him?—Merely to state that I had received them from Mr. Parker.
19659. How came you to do it?—I wanted to show him the transaction.
19660. Had there been any conversation about the certificates before?—Not that I know of.
19661. Recollect?—I think not.
19662. Will you undertake to say there was not?—I do not recollect.
19663. Will you undertake to say there was not?—I will not.
19664. Was there any conversation with Mr. Jones upon those certificates?—Not till yesterday.
19665. Do you mean to state that?—I think so.
19666. That will not satisfy me; do you mean to state there was no conversation about them before that?—The evening before, I spoke to an individual.
19667. To the person that carried the note?—Yes.
19668. You spoke to him about the certificates?—To go and fetch them.
19669. What was the nature of the conversation?—As he lived in that neighbourhood, that he would have the goodness to bring them up.
19670. Is that the first conversation you had about the certificates?—With him.
19671. Do you mean to say you had no conversation with Mr. Jones upon the subject of those certificates?—I do not think I had.
19672. Will you undertake to say you had not?—It is impossible to say.
19673. Will you undertake to say you had or had not?—I do not think I had.
19674. Had you with any other person?—I do not think I had.
19675. Will you undertake to say you had not?—No.
19676. Will you undertake to say it was not suggested to you when you sent for those certificates?—Certainly not.
19677. Do you mean to say you never suggested sending for those certificates till you asked the person behind to take that note?—Yes.
19678. Why did you not see Mr. Parker himself?—I have seen him several times, and asked him to bring them to town with him.
19679. When did you see him?—Three days ago.
19680. Is he in London?—Yes, I believe he is.
19681. Have you applied to him upon the subject?—Yes.
19682. And they were not produced till the note was sent?—No.

[The Witness withdrew.

Alfred Ryder, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Alfred Ryder.

19683. Mr. *Austin.*] IS William Ryder your brother?—Yes.
19684. Where do you live?—Cold Harbour-lane, Camberwell.
19685. Have you ever signed Rennie's deed?—No, I have not.
19686. You have not signed it?—Yes, I have signed it; I thought you said read it.
19687. No, that was not at all necessary; for 130 shares you signed it?—Yes.
19688. Nine thousand seven hundred and fifty pounds?—Yes.
19689. How much did you pay upon signing the deed?—£. 130.
19690. Where did you sign it?—I signed it at Fenchurch-street, at Messrs. Hankeys', the bankers.
19691. You got the bankers' receipt?—Yes; I got them there.
19692. Did you exchange the bankers' receipt for certificates?—Yes.
19693. Where?—At the Poultry.
19694. When?—That I cannot say exactly when; I did not keep any account of it.

19695. Where

19695. Where did you get those white certificates?—I bought them in the market in the first instance.

19696. Were they your shares or were they not?—They were my own.

19697. Were they all your own?—Yes; but at the time the call was made I borrowed 70 *l.* of my brother to pay the amount of the deposit, and he held part of the shares as security; he has them now.

19698. Then, in fact, he was interested in 70 *l.* worth of these shares?—Yes.

19699. And he has them now?—Yes.

19700. What was your occupation at this time?—I was formerly a clerk with Mr. Box, a proctor.

19701. What was your salary?—I made about 100 *l.* a-year.

19702. Were you aware of the extent of the liability you incurred by signing the deed?—No farther than if I pay the instalments as they become due

19703. Do you expect to pay the whole 9,750 *l.*?—No; nor do I think there was one, if they were called upon to pay, would keep to it.

19704. You must not answer for all of them; but you have no such expectation?—Not at all.

19705. But if it should turn out you are called upon, should you find a difficulty in paying 9,750 *l.*?—Yes, it is quite out of the question, but I believe they are not bought with the intention of paying the whole down.

19706. You mean they are not bought with the intention of paying the whole at all?—I mean the instalments.

19707. You did not buy them with the intention of paying the instalments at all?—No, not at all.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

19708. What is your brother?—In Doctor's Commons.

19709. In the same office you were?—No; he has left it.

19710. Is he clerk to a proctor?—Yes; he is managing the business for a person in a consumption.

19711. Were those shares bought in the market, in the ordinary course of business?—Yes.

19712. And at the regular market price?—Yes; I gave 10 *s.* a share for them.

19713. Whatever was the market price of the day?—Yes.

19714. Do you recollect when it was you signed the deed?—No; I do not.

19715. Was it in the month of November?—I am sure I cannot say.

19716. Did you produce the old scrip before you were allowed to sign the deed?—Yes.

19717. And you paid the deposit?—Yes.

19718. Sixty pound was your own, and 70 *l.* you borrowed from your brother?—Yes.

19719. Does he hold those shares now?—Yes.

19720. Do you hold your own?—Part of them, and part I have disposed of.

19721. I believe you have resided at Camberwell for a very long time?—My parents have for about 40 years.

19722. And well known to the inhabitants of that neighbourhood?—Yes.

19723. Where do you live now?—With my brother, in Denmark-street, Cold Harbour-lane.

19724. Does not Denmark-street come into Cold Harbour-lane?—It is a turning in Cold Harbour-lane.

19725. Denmark-street, Cold Harbour-lane, is your present abode?—Yes.

19726. I believe your brother is possessed of freehold property in Camberwell?—Yes, he is.

19727. That is, in addition to what he derives from managing the proctor's business, he has independent property of his own?—Yes, he has.

19728. Is your brother capable of meeting the calls upon the shares he holds from time to time, not paying the whole down at once?—Yes, he is.

19729. Mr. *Austin.*] Do you understand the question?—Yes, I do.

19730. Mr. *Alexander.*] And you rely on receiving assistance from your brother, in paying the calls upon these shares, as you have received assistance from him in paying the deposits?—Yes, that is, supposing I have not disposed of them in the mean time.

Alfred Ryder.

20 May 1837.

19731. Just explain the answer you gave to my learned friend, Mr. Austin, that you did not believe that any person purchased the shares with the intention of paying the whole down at once. Did you mean, paying the whole amount down at once, or did you mean that they could not pay the calls?—I meant paying the whole down at once.

Re-examined by Mr. *Austin.*

19732. Where does your mother and father live?—In Cold Harbour-lane.

19733. What business does your father carry on?—Not any; he is now 90 years of age.

19734. Has he carried on any business?—Yes, he used to be a broker formerly.

19735. I believe he is not in very excellent circumstances just now?—No, he is not.

19736. You say your brother has some property?—Yes, he has.

19737. Has he some property that would have enabled him to pay 9,750 *l.*?—Certainly not, if called upon to pay it down at once.

19738. Would your brother ever have paid that sum?—He did not buy them with that intention; he did not know, neither did I know, that he was liable to pay the whole amount.

19739. But you have been asked questions to show you could have paid the money, if necessary; could you have paid the 9,750 *l.* if it had been necessary, suppose the law had been enforced against you?—Certainly not.

19740. Could your brother, if the law had been enforced against him?—No.

19741. And the shares were handed over to your brother as a security?—Yes.

19742. You were the party signing the deed, and liable?—Yes.

19743. Have you seen any of the parties on the other side?—I have been there.

19744. My learned friend seems to be well instructed in asking you questions; you have communicated the facts in your knowledge to him?—Not any; I have not spoken to him.

19745. To whom?—I have been to Rennie's office.

19746. After you had been served with a warrant?—No, before.

19747. Were you told you would be served?—I was told I should be wanted.

19748. You went to Rennie's office?—Yes.

19749. Did they ask you any questions there?—No, no further than there was a petition brought forward against my character.

19750. Not against your character at all, nor is your character at all attacked?—I believe it stated so far; it was nowhere to be found, but my father having lived there 40 years, if a letter had been directed to Camberwell I should have been found.

19751. You say a petition was produced?—I saw it at the office.

19752. Were you asked any questions about it?—No further than asking me if it was correct as far as my parents were concerned; I said it was.

19753. Did you see any other petition?—There was a petition; it was proposed for me to sign.

19754. Did you sign?—I did not.

19755. Was it cut and dried, as Mr. Clarkson said; I do not know the meaning of it, but was it cut and dried?—I do not know the meaning of it.

19756. Was the petition already written out upon paper?—It was the draft, I believe.

19757. To be signed?—I went there for it to be read over, and I was to call again, but it was not ready.

19758. Did you ever sign it?—No, I did not.

19759. You do not know what it was about?—That I was to be found in Cold Harbour-lane, and resided there, and that I believed my parents were in the situation they are.

19760. That has not been presented?—I believe not; I have not signed it.

19761. *Chairman.*] What was the substance of the petition, was it to the same effect that you have stated in your evidence to day?—Yes; it was in the petition that I was to be found in Cold Harbour-lane.

19762. It affected yourself only?—Yes.

19763. And your own character?—Yes. [The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Joseph Stearns*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

19764. Mr. *Austin*.] You have not signed Rennie's deed?—No.

19765. What are you?—A stockbroker.

19766. When were you sent for to attend this Committee; have you been summoned?—Yes.

19767. When?—Yesterday morning.

19768. Have you seen anybody about the evidence you were supposed likely to give before the Committee?—How do you mean?

19769. Have you seen any persons who have asked you questions?—No.

19770. Have you given any information to anybody?—I have spoken on the case at home.

19771. You have given no information to any person connected with these transactions?—I have not.

19772. You live in Hercules-passage?—Yes.

19773. Do you know Thomas Turner?—I know Thomas Turner.

19774. Was he a clerk in your office?—I do not consider him in the light of a clerk.

19775. Was he with you?—Yes.

19776. At what time was he with you; was he with you during the last year?—Yes.

19777. From the time that Rennie's railroad was projected?—He has been with me five or six years.

19778. In what capacity has he been in your office?—I can hardly call him a clerk, he receives no salary whatever; he was placed in my office by his father, thinking he might like to go into the Stock Exchange himself.

19779. Where does he live himself?—In South-square, Gray's-inn.

19780. Do you know the state of his health at present?—I believe it is improving now.

19781. He has been very unwell?—Very ill.

19782. Have you seen him lately?—Two or three evenings back.

19783. Do you happen to know whether he has been summoned to attend this Committee?—I know he has.

19784. He has not attended?—He is not able.

19785. He has not appeared?—I take for granted he has not.

19786. Do you know whether Turner signed this deed or not?—I did not see him sign; I cannot swear he signed the deed; if I could see his writing I think I could swear to it (*the deed was shown to the Witness*), that is his handwriting.

19787. Assuming that to be the subscription-deed, have you any doubt he signed the subscription-deed?—No doubt.

19788. I suppose that letter to the chairman is also his handwriting (*handing a paper to the Witness*)?—Yes, that is his handwriting.

19789. I see he signed for 12,750 *l.* altogether, you do not know where he got his certificates?—Do you mean the original certificates.

19790. Yes, the white certificates or scrip?—Yes, I do.

19791. Do you know what colour it was?—I think they were white; you mean the first ones.

19792. Yes?—They were white.

19793. Do you happen to know where he got them?—Yes.

19794. Where?—I was not aware till I came here, that he had signed in two places; the first is five shares.

19795. The next is 165 shares?—Yes.

19796. My question was, do you know where he got the shares?—Respecting the first five shares, they were my own five shares.

19797. Were they white certificates?—I do not remember the colour.

19798. They were Rennie's certificates, whatever the colour may have been?—Yes.

19799. How came they to get into Mr. Turner's hands?—I asked him if he had any objection to exchange them for the blue shares for me.

19800. Did you give him the certificates to do so?—I handed them over to him.

19801. And any deposit money?—I should say so, but I cannot remember; it is so trifling a thing I cannot recollect.

19802. You think you did?—Yes.

 19803. Did

Mr. *Joseph Stearns.*

20 May 1837.

19803. Did you happen to know the course of business at that time with these shares?—As near as I can remember, I think it was the last day; I did not care whether they were paid up or not, it was only five shares.

19804. Did you know what was necessary to be done to renew the certificates?—Yes, I knew it was necessary to pay a pound a share.

19805. You knew the course of business?—Yes.

19806. Did you deliver the certificates to him to get the new ones?—Yes.

19807. Did he get the new ones?—I should say he did.

19808. What became of them?—I believe I have them still.

19809. They are blue?—Yes.

19810. You knew that the deed was to be signed before the new certificates were to be obtained?—Yes, I did.

19811. Did you direct him to sign for you?—No; I asked him if he had any objection to go to the office and get the shares exchanged.

19812. And sign in his own name?—To get the shares exchanged. I asked him if he had any objection, and he said none whatever.

19813. He signed for you for five shares?—Yes.

19814. They are your property?—Yes.

19815. They were never his?—No.

19816. His name stands there for a liability for which he has given no consideration?—His name stands there as the holder of the shares.

19817. And liable to pay, and he has given no consideration for that liability?—To whom?

19818. To anybody: the shares are not his, and he has made himself liable by signing the deed?—Yes.

19819. That was done at your request?—Yes.

19820. Do you know anything about the next lot, 165 shares, which I think you saw entered upon the deed; does No. 2, Hercules-passage, describe your residence?—Yes.

19821. Do you know anything about the second lot?—I know that they do not belong to me.

19822. Did you know anything about them before you saw that deed?—Yes.

19823. Then be so good as to communicate your knowledge to the Committee?—Do you mean to ask me if I know from whom Turner received them?

19824. Yes?—He received them from Mr. Mackenzie.

19825. Who is Mr. Mackenzie?—He is on the Stock Exchange.

19826. A member of the Stock Exchange?—Yes.

19827. Is he a friend or acquaintance of yours in business?—Yes.

19828. Have you had any dealings with him in business?—Yes.

19829. At what time did Mr. Makenzie give him these 165 shares?—At what time in the day?

19830. No: was it about the same time you gave him your shares?—From the appearance of the deed I should think it was the same day.

19831. From your memory?—I had no recollection about the five till I came here.

19832. Do you remember Mr. Mackenzie being with Mr. Turner at the time when the 165 shares were handed over?—Mr. Mackenzie gave the shares to me, and I handed them over to Mr. Turner.

19833. When did he give them to you?—On the same day.

19834. For what purpose?—To be exchanged for new shares.

19835. Were they his property?—That I cannot say; I do not know where he got them.

19836. Did you make any inquiries?—No, I did not.

19837. What were Mr. Mackenzie's instructions to you?—Mr. Mackenzie asked me if I could get them exchanged for new shares.

19838. If you would get them exchanged?—If I could get them.

19839. Why did he not get them exchanged himself?—I do not know.

19840. What did you understand by his asking you to get them exchanged, they being his property?—What did I understand?

19841. You did not think he meant you to sign the deed?—No, I should think not.

19842. What did you understand he meant by it?—I understood he wished to get new shares for them.

19843. He might have got new shares by going and signing the deed?—Yes.

19844. I understand

19844. I understand he did not do so, and applied to you; and you say he did not wish you to sign it; what do you conceive he meant, my question was?—I can hardly tell.

19845. I want to know what you suppose he meant when he came to you, and said, "Will you be so good as to get these 165 old certificates exchanged for new;" you say he did not expect you to sign, what did he mean?—To get the certificates exchanged and sign the deed.

19846. He did not suppose you were going to do that?—No.

19847. You would not have signed for Mr. Mackenzie?—No, I would not.

19848. Of course you would not have signed the deed on any account?—I had a great aversion to it.

19849. Do you not think Mr. Mackenzie had a similar feeling?—He might have had.

19850. Was not his object to get somebody to sign the deed for him?—I should think it was.

19851. You understood him so, did you not, at the time he gave you the certificates?—I really do not know what I thought at the time; it was late in the day, it was about three o'clock.

19852. Upon receiving the certificates, what did you do?—I asked Mr. Turner if he had any objection to sign the deed for these shares.

19853. How long after you received them, did you ask him?—Within a quarter of an hour.

19854. Where did you see Mr. Mackenzie?—On the Stock Exchange.

19855. Then you went across to Hercules-passage, and saw Mr. Turner?—Yes.

19856. Almost immediately?—Yes.

19857. He was the person you thought of?—Yes, having signed in the morning for five for me.

19858. You went to him, and gave him the certificates?—No, I asked him if he had any objection to sign, and he said none.

19859. And then you gave him the certificates?—Yes.

19860. And the money?—I think it was a cheque drawn.

19861. On whom?—On my bankers.

19862. Who drew it?—Either myself or Mr. Turner.

19863. You signed the cheque?—Yes.

19864. Then you advanced the amount of the cheque to Mr. Mackenzie?—Yes.

19865. You settled that afterwards with Mr Mackenzie?—Mr. Mackenzie afterwards paid me.

19866. So that in effect the certificates of Mr. Mackenzie were furnished to Mr. Turner, and you gave him a cheque?—Yes.

19867. Mr. Turner took the certificates and cheque, did he bring back the blue certificates?—Yes.

19868. Did you see the blue certificates?—Yes, I think I did.

19869. Did you take them into your possession?—No, I think not.

19870. Do you know what became of them?—I think he took them to Mr. Mackenzie.

19871. Now, I understand, where Turner's name appears for five shares, those five shares are your property; and, where it appears for 165 shares, 12,375 *l.*, those shares are or were Mr. Mackenzie's property?—I cannot say that; they came from him.

19872. At all events, Turner has no interest whatever in either of the sets of shares?—No, I should think not, certainly.

19873. In fact, from your knowledge of Turner, which is now considerable, Turner is not able to meet a legal demand for 12,000 *l.*, is he, suppose the law was enforced against him upon this instrument?—Do you mean to ask me whether he is worth 12,000 *l.*?

19874. It comes to that?—Certainly not.

19875. *Chairman.*] Suppose the instalments to be called for?—If he was to be the holder of the whole of them he could not pay.

19876. Mr. *Austin.*] That you knew at the time you gave him the certificates; you were acquainted with his circumstances at the time?—I never supposed him worth that money.

19877. I need hardly ask you; of course you are able to meet any demand upon the five shares?—Yes.

Mr. *Joseph Stearns.*

20 May 1837.

19878. And I presume Mr. Mackenzie would have been able to meet a sum equal to 12,000 *l.*?—That I cannot say.

19879. Have you any doubt that Turner is ill, and not able to attend the Committee?—I have no doubt of it whatever.

19880. Do you happen to know, from your conversation with Turner, that Turner had been required to attend this Committee before you were required to attend?—Yes.

19881. Some time before?—Some few days before.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

19882. Are you in partnership with anybody else, or do you carry on business by yourself alone?—By myself.

19883. Have you been in business some years as a stockbroker?—Yes.

19884. How many?—Ten or 11 years.

19885. You are quite equal to pay the amount of your own five shares?—Yes.

19886. Even if called upon all at once?—Yes.

19887. Is Mr. Mackenzie a gentleman who has been long in business as a stockbroker?—No.

19888. How long?—About two years.

19889. Is he a member in any firm, or in business alone?—Alone.

19890. You are both stockbrokers?—Yes.

19891. How does Turner happen to live in South-place, Gray's Inn; is he connected with the law in any way?—Not at all.

19892. He has been learning the business of a stockbroker in your office?—During the time he has been there.

19893. You are acquainted with his family?—Yes, partly.

19894. You say his father had placed him there to learn the business?—Yes.

19895. When you say he could not pay the sum of 12,750 *l.*, do you think he is unable to pay it suppose the calls were distributed over five or six years?—Do you mean by his own resources?

19896. Yes?—I should say not.

19897. *Chairman.*] Is he of age?—Yes; he could not pay out of his own private property.

19898. Mr. *Alexander.*] Mr. Mackenzie is a gentleman able to pay that sum in the course of five or six years?—I do not know.

19899. Have you had many transactions of this kind while you have been on the Stock Exchange?—No, no other.

19900. You never sent anybody to sign for you before?—No.

19901. Have you known transactions of the same kind take place among members of the Stock Exchange?—No, I have not inquired.

19902. Have you ever heard of it without making inquiries, or did the suggestion occur to yourself; how did it happen to occur to you, that you sent anybody else to sign the deed for you?—It was a mere chance, it arose upon the first five shares.

19903. How did that idea originate; was it from hearing that it was the practice of members of the Stock Exchange to send substitutes to sign for them, or did it occur to your own mind?—I cannot say; if I had not asked Turner in the morning whether he had any objection to change the shares for me, the shares would have been lost entirely, I should not have troubled myself about them.

19904. I was asking you whether the plan of getting another person to sign for you and saving the shares, had originated in your own mind, or whether you had heard it was the practice of others to do so?—I cannot say which.

19905. It was the first transaction of the kind you were concerned in?—Yes.

19906. Have you been a shareholder in other companies?—In other railway companies.

19907. In other companies of the same nature, railroad or canals, or any companies in which it is necessary to have the parliamentary deed signed before they can appear in the House of Commons?—No; I do not think I have.

19908. Cannot you speak with certainty?—I may have a share in one or two other companies, but I have had very few shares indeed.

19909. Have you had any others, have you any others at present?—No.

19910. Can you recollect if you have had any?—I do not think I have.

19911. Have you ever signed a deed at all?—Yes, I had some shares in Cundy's line.

19912. That

Mr. *Joseph Stearns.*

20 May 1837.

19912. That is one of the Brighton Railways?—Yes.

19913. Did you sign the deed in that case?—Yes, I did.

19914. Can you recollect whether you have any in any others?—No.

19915. What number of shares had you in Cundy's Line?—I cannot tell correctly.

19916. Was it 5, or 10, or 50, or 100, or 200?—I think it was 40.

19917. And you signed for yourself?—Yes.

19918. You say, you did not tell Turner he was to sign the deed for you, but to get the old scrip exchanged for new; but you knew as a preliminary step it was necessary that the deed should be signed by the person presenting the scrip?—Yes.

19919. So that when you told him to get the old scrip exchanged for new, you knew it was necessary that the deed should be signed?—I did not tell him that, I asked him if he had any objection.

19920. When he said he had none, you directed him to go?—I asked him to go.

19921. You were aware it was a necessary preliminary step that the deed should be signed?—Yes.

19922. And that upon a gentleman presenting the old scrip and paying the deposit, and signing the deed, he would get the new scrip?—Yes, I took for granted he would.

19923. You were aware that that was the course of practice in railway offices?—I have had so little to do with them, I cannot say exactly.

19924. Did you not know that was the course of practice?—Yes.

19925. Does Turner occupy those chambers in the South-square, Gray's Inn, alone, or does anybody reside with him?—His brother.

19926. What line of business is his brother in?—An attorney.

19927. They live in those chambers?—Yes.

19928. What age is Turner, the one who was with you?—About 27 or 28.

19929. Have you still got your shares?—Yes.

19930. Do you know whether Mr. Mackenzie holds his?—I do not know.

19931. Did you buy yours in the market?—Yes, I did.

Re-examined by Mr. *Austin.*

19932. Do you know Robert Johnstone, a member of the Stock Exchange?—Yes; I think I know Robert Johnstone.

19933. Do you agree with him in this opinion; he is asked, "Is it the common practice of stockbrokers to subscribe in their own names to railway companies on behalf of other persons, the subscribers having no interest whatever in the shares?" to which he answered, "I should think not; I should think no stockbroker would sign his name to any deed for any friend." The next question is, "No respectable broker?" he says, "No; I have had shares that I have given money to others to sign for me, that the responsibility might go off my own shoulders." Do you agree with him that no respectable stockbroker would sign his name to any deed for another?—I should think many respectable stockbrokers have signed a deed.

19934. For a friend, on behalf of any other person?—I dare say some might be found who would do it.

19935. You would not do it?—No.

19936. My learned friend says you would not do it for Mr. Mackenzie; would you have done it for anybody?—No, I would not.

19937. Do you not agree with Mr. Johnstone that no respectable stockbroker would do it?—I cannot say I am a competent judge to answer that question; some might be found, but I would not do it.

19938. Who would deserve the epithet respectable?—Who so consider themselves; I would not.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *James Whittan*, was again called in; and further Examined, as follows:

Mr. *James Whitta.*

19939. Mr. *Austin.*] YOU have been examined before?—I have.

19940. You had lost one of your jobbing books?—Yes, exactly.

19941. For the month of January?—Yes.

19942. Am I correct in stating it so?—Yes.

Mr. *James Whittan.*

20 May 1837.

19943. Have you found it since?—No, it is destroyed; it is the one I cut up for my razors.

19944. You said something about a cash-book on that occasion?—Yes, I did.

19945. Have you found that cash-book?—I have it in my pocket.

19946. Have the goodness to produce it, and keep it your hand, and the bankers' book also?—Exactly.

19947. We have had a Mr. Frith here yesterday, and we asked him some questions; do you know that?—I am aware of it, at least I heard so from him.

19948. Did Mr. Frith tell you the questions we had been asking him as to his disposing of certain shares in January?—Yes, he spoke to me about it.

19949. Did he tell you it last night, or this morning?—He spoke to me of it directly he came out.

19950. Were you in attendance here then?—Yes, I have been in attendance here several days, and have been put to very great loss and inconvenience; I have applied repeatedly to be examined. (*The Witness produced some papers*).

19951. Have you a list in your hand?—I have taken out a few things that might save time.

19952. Have you got a list of the shares that Mr. Frith transferred to you?—No, I have not any list; I have an account of the receipts and payments.

19953. Did he give you an account of the shares he sold you?—No; if I bought them in the market I sold them to him, and we kept a joint account.

19954. On the 4th of January, it appears by Mr. Frith's book, (he has not used it for shaving) he sold 50 shares to Mr. Huckvale, and 50 to you; do you find any trace of that?—No, not the slightest.

19955. On the 3d of January he sold 20 to you; on the 4th he sold 50 to you, and 5, and 20; do you find any trace of that?—Not the slightest.

19956. On the 5th he sold 50 to you?—I do not know; I paid him 35 *l.* 6 *s.* 3 *d.* on that day, it might have been for Stephenson's or anything else, or a balance cheque.

19957. On the 9th he sold you 10; on the 11th, 15; on the 17th, 150 and 30; do you find any trace of them?—Not the slightest.

19958. Would they have appeared in the last book?—I question if they would, for when I did a bargain I handed them to him.

19959. Your book was not so correct as his, he appears to have entered them? This was the book we relied upon; sometimes I put them down on a piece of paper or a card.

19960. *Chairman.*] When you say we, who do you mean?—Mr. Huckvale, Mr. Frith, and me; we were engaged in a kind of partnership in Rennie's; we jobbed in them, and were the only parties who did.

19961. On the 18th, 110, 60, 10 and 40; on the 25th, 50; on the 26th, 50; on the 27th, 50 and 5; on the 28th, 20; on the 30th, 50 and 10?—It is very likely I can give you no account of them.

19962. Does not the cash-book help you?—No; I see a number of payments at the time, but I cannot say what for.

19963. Can you inform the Committee what became of them?—No, not the least; I sold part of them to different brokers, and perhaps I have some of them in my box now.

19964. Cannot you recollect who you sold them to; there are 100 and 50 and 30 sold in one day, that is, the 10th; do you not remember to whom you sold them?—On the 17th I have got a payment of 300 *l.* on account of Rennie's, but I cannot tell what it was for.

19965. Nor to whom you sold the scrip?—I have not the slightest idea.

19966. There are 800 sold by you to Mr. Frith, cannot you recollect who you sold any of those to?—No, it is impossible; I have, January 14th, 100 *l.* paid to Rennie's.

19967. Will that book assist you at all?—Not the slightest.

19968. You cannot recollect to whom you sold any of those certificates?—It is impossible to remember any individual transaction; any man of business could tell at once it was impossible to recollect any one transaction, when there are 100 in the course of a day; it is impossible to recollect any one.

19969. I do not want any particular one, but any one?—I cannot tell any one.

19970. Not in the last six months?—No.

19971. Did you deal with any particular person?—No; any person that came upon the market.

19972. Did you ever deal with Mr. Hankey on the Stock Exchange?—We have no broker of that name.

19973. Is he a jobber?—No.

19974. Do you know Mr. Mackenzie?—Yes.

19975. Did you ever sell any to him?—Yes, very likely; and bought of him too, no doubt of it.

19976. On the 18th, you will find there are 220 shares you bought of Mr. Frith. Is there anything in your bankers' book to lead you to what was done with them?—I have no receipt from him or payment to him on that day.

19977. Did you deal largely with Mr. Mackenzie in these shares?—Not to any extent; I do the business he has to do, if I have any opportunity of doing it.

19978. Do you know Mr. Alfred Alers Hankey?—I know the gentleman of that name, he is in Palmer's house; Palmer and Hope's house.

19979. Had you any dealing with him?—I do not remember any at all.

19980. Is Mr. Mackenzie the only person with whom you recollect having dealings?—No; I cannot say with certainty I have not had dealings with Palmer's; I see here is five Rennie's sold to Palmer's at five-eighths discount, and 10 sold at one-half discount to Palmer's.

19981. How many more may you have sold to Palmer's?—I do not see any others.

19982. Did you ever buy any of them?—I do not recollect any.

19983. Am I to collect you have no memory upon the subject?—I cannot recollect a single transaction with them.

19984. Am I to understand that you tell the Committee, after being pressed, you have no recollection of the persons of whom you bought or to whom you sold?—I say at once, I have no perfect recollection of the persons I dealt with, or the times I dealt with them; I have no doubt I have dealt with Palmer's.

19985. Have you ever dealt with Mr. Sutton?—Yes, certainly.

19986. With Mr. Robert Sutton?—With the house generally.

19987. In Rennie's shares?—Yes.

19988. Bought of them?—Yes; and sold no doubt.

19989. To what amount?—I cannot recollect.

19990. I suppose not?—Why do you suppose not?

19991. To a considerable amount?—Cannot say.

19992. To a small amount?—Cannot say.

19993. Have you dealt with them at all?—I said I had.

19994. Have you bought 500 shares of them?—I have already said I could not say how many.

19995. Will you undertake to say you have not bought 500 shares of them?—No.

19996. You will not undertake to say you may not have bought 500 of Mr. Sutton.—No.

19997. Will you undertake to say you have not sold them 500?—No.

19998. Nor 1,000?—No.

19999. Or 2,000?—Do you mean in one transaction?

20000. No, altogether?—Cannot say.

20001. Will you undertake to say, you have not bought 2,000 of Sutton's house?—I have nothing at all to say to that; I should be rash in saying I have or have not.

20002. Have you any means of forming a belief as to the extent of your transactions?—Not the slightest, none at all.

20003. Do you believe you ever bought 500 of Sutton's house?—I cannot say anything at all about it.

20004. Do you believe you have sold 500?—These questions appear to be so frivolous, I do not know what to say to them.

20005. *Chairman.*] You are not to form an opinion upon that, but to give an answer to the question.

20006. Mr. *Austin.*] Will you be so good as to attend to the form of my question; do you believe you have sold them 500 shares at any time?—I do not know.

20007. Or that you have bought of them to that amount?—Cannot say.

20008. Do you believe you have had extensive transactions with them?—I do not know to what extent I have dealt with them; I have dealt with them the same

Mr. *James Whittan.*

20 May 1837.

same as I have any other broker that came into the market, if I had an opportunity.

20009. Do you believe your transactions with them have been extensive?—Not very considerable, certainly.

20010. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by "not very considerable"?—I should think 2,000 shares in one transaction is a pretty considerable transaction.

20011. Mr. *Austin.*] Is the amount of your answer this: you have never bought of them, or sold 2,000 shares to them in one transaction?—Certainly, never.

20012. Will you say you have never bought or sold to them 500 in one transaction?—Certainly, never.

20013. Three hundred?—No.

20014. Two hundred?—I cannot tell you now.

20015. As you have now told me you cannot tell whether you ever bought or sold 200 shares to Messrs. Sutton in one transaction, will you undertake to say you have not bought or sold 2,000 shares altogether to and from Sutton's?—No, I cannot say that.

20016. Will you undertake to say you have not sold those very shares to Sutton's, or some of them, that were sold to you by Mr. Frith?—It is very likely, if I sold the shares to them, I bought them of Mr. Frith; they all went into his account.

20017. All the shares you dealt in came through Mr. Frith?—Yes, he kept the general account.

20018. Did Mr. Frith buy of Mr. Sutton?—I am sure I do not know.

20019. Will you undertake to say that none of the shares that Mr. Frith sold you were sold by you to Mr. Sutton?—No; I will not undertake to say that.

20020. Was the effect of this partnership of yours to raise the price in the market at that time?—Not at all.

20021. It was not?—No.

20022. What was the object then?—What do we get our living by, but by jobbing; we get the turn of the market, and if we bought of one man, we sold to others.

20023. The object was to get the turn of the market, as far as you were concerned?—Yes, of course.

20024. Was the whole effect of it to raise the market at any time?—No; it never had that effect.

20025. Did you observe the state of the market from day to day?—No.

20026. Was the market higher or lower at the end of your operations?—They are not concluded yet.

20027. We are speaking of the end of January; do you mean that the prices were not higher at the end of these operations than at the beginning?—As far as I can recollect, they were better.

20028. How much?—Perhaps 10*s.* a share, or something of that kind.

20029. Do you know Mr. George Jones?—Yes; that is the gentleman (*pointing to a person in the room*). I believe his name is George.

20030. Do you know him?—I have seen him; I do not think I ever spoke to him till the last two days.

20031. You never had any business with him?—No; I had never the pleasure of doing anything with him.

20032. Do you remember the state of the market, so far as Rennie's shares were concerned, in November and December?—No, I do not.

20033. Did you deal in the shares then?—Yes.

20034. Was the market as active in December as January?—I cannot recollect.

20035. Did you do much business in Rennie's in December and January?—I cannot say; I have dealt with them since they came out; I cannot say whether there was a great deal of business doing or a little.

20036. When did you three begin?—That I cannot say.

20037. Surely you can recollect that?—No, I cannot.

20038. You dealt upon terms?—Yes.

20039. Surely you can recollect when you agreed upon the terms?—Upon my word I cannot recollect.

20040. Was it in December or January?—It might have been in November or September.

20041. When

20041. When did you leave off?—We have not left off yet.

20042. Have you not left off yet?—Yes, we have as far as Mr. Frith is concerned, but not as to Mr. Huckvale and me.

20043. When did you close with Mr. Frith?—A few days since.

20044. When did you wind up?—I think the 10th of this month, I am not sure.

20045. On the 10th you arranged with him?—We have not closed the account, but we job no longer.

20046. Whatever the form may be, you have struck the balance?—It is not settled yet; I shall have to receive or deliver him some shares.

20047. But no further transactions are going on between you now?—No.

20048. You have been a stranger to any of his transaction since the 10th?—Yes.

20049. Before Mr. Frith was examined?—No, I think not; when I say the 10th, I am not positive.

20050. I thought you looked at your book?—I have a payment made to him, and I thought that was the day we settled the account, but I have a balance, I see, now.

20051. Do you recollect Mr. Huckvale being examined the first day?—I recollect his being here; I was here at the time.

20052. Did you see him after his examination?—Yes.

20053. Did you know he had lost one of his jobbing-books?—I did not know he kept one.

20054. Did you ever hear from him he had lost one?—No.

20055. Did you hear he had been asked for one he could not produce?—I heard Mr. Van Soncer say that he had heard an order given to Mr. Huckvale to produce his jobbing-book.

20056. And that it was lost?—I did not hear that.

00057. And yours had been destroyed at that time?—Yes.

20058. Did you ever ask Mr. Frith to let you look at his jobbing-book, since you knew you were to be examined?—I should never think of asking such a thing.

20059. Not after you had been asked whether you had lost your own?—No, why should I?

20060. Never mind that, only answer my questions?—Certainly not.

20061. Where would you find the amount of your transactions with Mr. Frith and Mr. Huckvale, other than in the jobbing-books, so as to enable you to come to a settlement?—We put them on a piece of paper; in fact my recollection is sufficient.

20062. Let me understand; is it the putting on the paper or the sufficiency of your recollection, or both?—I do not understand you; the putting on a piece of paper is sufficient to remind me of the transactions.

20063. I ask you, as you have lost your jobbing-book, how you would be able to settle your transactions with Mr. Frith?—By my present jobbing-book.

20064. Your late answer was, putting on a paper, or my memory?—I generally put it on a piece of paper, and afterwards enter it in the jobbing-book.

20065. Does that contain an entry of your transactions for the month for which it is kept?—Yes.

20066. If you have lost your jobbing-book for January, how can you settle with Mr. Frith?—It is settled already, we had a settling once a week, or once in three weeks; the thing is wound up, and the balance is paid or received; the last time I settled with him was the 6th of May, and I paid him 184 *l.* 6 *s.* 9 *d.*

20067. Is there anything else except that between the 6th of May, and the conclusion?—No.

20068. There will be four or five days to deal with?—Yes.

20069. There is nothing more to be settled but that?—No.

20070. When did you settle with him before that?—That I can tell.

20071. When did you settle with him, in January?—On January the 3d, I received 60 *l.* 5 *s.*

20072. That was at the settlement?—No it was not.

20073. I want to know the settlement?—£. 35 6 *s.* 3 *d.* on the 5th; that looks like a settlement.

20074. Just look to the close of January; when have you settled there?—On the 31st of January I received from him 125 *l.*

Mr. *James Whittan.*

20 May 1837.

20075. Was that a settlement?—I cannot say.

20076. Have you found the date when the January transactions were made square?—I cannot tell by that.

20077. Can you tell whether they were settled in any way?—They are certainly settled.

20078. Were they ever settled before the 6th May?—Yes, certainly.

20079. When did you tear up your book, for your shaving purposes?—It is a long time since; I have commenced now with the check margins, because I have exhausted the jobbing-book.

20080. With the talons of your checks?—Yes.

20081. What has become of your jobbing-book for February?—I have it in my pocket.

20082. Do you mean to tell me, with your February book in your pocket, and the book you hold in your hand, and the parchment book on the table, that you cannot tell when the month of January was settled with Mr. Frith?—I can safely say I cannot.

20083. Having given me an answer, which I consider a flippant answer, that you have used your jobbing-book for shaving, and have begun with the talons of your check-book, when did you begin with that?—I cannot say that; it is half gone.

20084. Why did you not apply the February jobbing-book to that purpose?—It has lasted till now.

20085. It contains February, March, April and May?—It does.

20086. I understand you to give as a final answer, you cannot recollect the amount or the names of the persons with whom you dealt in your operations in Rennie's shares in January?—I cannot.

20087. And you can give no further information than you have given?—No further.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

20088. You are a stockjobber, as I understand?—Yes.

20089. Messrs. Sutton & Co. are stockbrokers or stockjobbers?—Stockbrokers.

20090. Is there a more respectable house in the business that you know of?—I should think it one of the most respectable houses in the city, or as brokers.

20091. My learned friend has asked you the price of Rennie's in January; do you happen to know the price of Stephenson's?—I have not any idea.

20092. If my learned friend wanted to know, Wettenhall's list would supply both?—No doubt of it.

20093. In the dealings you have had with Messrs. Sutton's house, whether they have been large or small, I ask you upon your honour and credit, have they been dealings in the ordinary way of business with brokers?—In the ordinary way, and no other way, that I know of.

20094. You have been asked a great many questions, which you have answered by saying your recollection does not serve you; were you ever exposed to such an examination into your affairs by any man or body of men before?—Never in my life.

20095. You have been asked whether you asked Mr. Frith to let you look at his private jobbing-book; is it the practice of any honourable man to ask to inspect the books of any other dealers?—Certainly not, it would be considered an insult.

20096. Perhaps you have not been asked by any of Stephenson's people to let them look at your jobbing-books, except through my learned friend?—Certainly not.

20097. One of my learned friend's questions to you was, whether you asked Mr. Frith to let you look at his jobbing-book after he left this room?—Yes.

20098. Have the goodness to explain to me whether the business of a stockjobber is not to supply the market with such shares and stock, and such matters of sale as the market affords?—Yes, to deal with them as they are brought in or wanted.

20099. Is the business of a stockbroker distinguished from a stockjobber by their purchases or sales for his employers, or clients as we should call them?—Yes, according to the commissions from his principals.

20100. A jobber supplies the articles of sale?—Yes, he is the middle-man.

20101. It seems to me to have been insinuated that these shares had either come from Messrs. Sutton's house or went to Messrs. Sutton's house, either that they

they put them in the market or withdrew them from the market; upon your honour, have you ever had any transaction of the kind with Messrs. Sutton's house?—Never.

20102. Have you any reason to know or believe that Messrs. Sutton's house, and by that I mean the Messrs. Suttons, old and young, or Mr. Gribble, or any member of the firm, have, in any sort of way, directly or indirectly, lent themselves to the circulation of those shares in any form whatever, except as stock-brokers?—Certainly not.

20103. *Chairman.*] Do you mean, by certainly not, that they have not, or that you do not know that they have?—That they have not to my knowledge, and I can imagine no others that have.

20104. Mr. *Clarkson.*] To your knowledge or belief, I ask you, you have not asked to look into Messrs. Sutton's cash-book?—No, certainly not.

20105. Are they esteemed in the city as highly honourable and respectable men?—Yes, they are esteemed as one of the first houses in the city as brokers.

20106. Are you aware of any transaction, either in the market or anywhere else, that in the slightest degree reflects upon the credit and honour of any gentleman in that establishment?—Not at all.

20107. Or any other director of Rennie's Brighton Line?—I do not know any other director.

Re-examined by Mr. *Rowe.*

20108. It is not in the slightest degree intended to impute anything against the respectability of Messrs. Sutton's house, but when any stockbroker's house throws any quantity of shares upon the market, is it your duty to inquire into their object?—Certainly not.

20109. Is not the object a secret in the market?—Yes, quite so.

20110. *Chairman.*] Do you know or believe that Messrs. Sutton's house have thrown any number of shares upon the market for any purpose whatever?—I do not know it.

20111. Mr. *Rowe.*] Can you undertake to say that these shares, or a very large portion of them, did not come to you or go from you to Messrs. Sutton's house?—I cannot say that.

20112. *Chairman.*] In any transaction you may have had with Messrs. Sutton's house, either to purchase or to sell, or on the market not furnishing you with the amount of either, have you reason to believe that the transactions were anything but the ordinary transactions of a jobber with a broker?—No; the same transactions I had with other brokers who came into the market to sell shares.

20113. Mr. *Rowe.*] Suppose any other house had thrown 1,500 or 2,000 shares of any Line, Stephenson's if you please, into the market, would it have been your business to inquire the object?—No.

20114. You would not have known it, unless they had chosen to have disclosed it?—I should naturally have inquired the object, whether there was anything wrong, and have been careful of buying.

20115. But if such a number of shares had come into your hands in the course of three weeks or a month, should you have inquired?—It is a thing that never would have happened; we should not have bought so many shares.

20116. Perhaps you are not aware it is in evidence, that you had 2,000 shares pass through your hands in the course of January?—Those were bought and sold.

20117. That is what I mean?—We may transfer 10,000 shares in a day.

20118. Would your transactions in those shares enable you to know whether those shares were brought in or withdrawn by any particular broker?—If a broker came into the market I should know whether he was buying or selling.

20119. Mr. *Clarkson.*] The number of shares my learned friend has been suggesting to you; did you deal with them generally in the market, among such customers as you could find to buy them?—Yes, with the brokers who came with orders from their principals to buy or sell.

20120. Mr. *Rowe.*] Are you unable to tell the Committee from whom you received those shares, or to whom you disposed of them?—I cannot tell; I have no motive to conceal it if I could.

20121. Mr. *Forster.*] Do you ever buy and sell to the same party in the same day?—Yes, it has so happened; I have received different orders from different principals to sell and to buy them.

Mr. *James Whittan.*

20 May 1837.

20122. Has it ever happened in the cases of these shares that you have sold and bought for the same party in the same day?—Yes, frequently.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *George Lewin* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *George Lewin.*

20123. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the George Lewin, whose name appears upon Rennie's list in this way, "George Lewin, 18, Chapel-place, Bermondsey, accountant"?—Yes, I am.

20124. Fifty shares?—Yes.

20125. £.3,750?—Yes.

20126. Can you tell me when you signed that deed?—I think it was in the early part of December last; I cannot speak to the date.

20127. In whose employ were you at that time?—I am in the employment of Messrs. Rennies.

20128. You were at that time?—Yes, and now too.

20129. Do you recollect whether you signed the deed at the bankers', or at Chapel-place, in the Poultry?—At Chapel-place.

20130. Did you present old white scrip?—I signed at the request of Mr. Rennie.

20131. Did you present old white scrip when you went there?—Mr. Rennie had previously arranged it.

20132. *Chairman.*] Give a direct answer to the question first, and add your explanation afterwards.

20133. Mr. *Rowe.*] When you went to the Poultry, you did not present ol scrip?—No.

20134. You merely presented yourself?—Yes.

20135. To sign the deed?—Yes.

20136. Who did you see?—Mr. Dean.

20137. The secretary?—Yes.

20138. In the board-room?—Yes, it was.

20139. Was any other person present?—That I cannot recollect; I think there was, but I am not aware who he was.

20140. Do you recollect the time of day?—Yes, it was about three in the afternoon; I think it was, I am not sure.

20141. In the hours of business?—I do not know their hours of business.

20142. Did you tell Mr. Dean you were come to sign the deed?—Yes.

20143. Did you tell him for whom you were come to sign it?—He was aware who I was to sign for; I told him that I called from Mr. George Rennie to sign the deed.

20144. Did you present any white scrip at that time?—I did not.

20145. Did you state to Mr. Dean why you did not?—No, I did not. I told him I called from Mr. George Rennie; he was aware I was to call; and I signed the deed.

20146. You say Mr. Dean was aware you were to call?—Yes.

20147. Explain to the Committee how you know that?—Mr. George Rennie asked me, if I had any objection to hold shares in my name for him, in trust; he stated the reason which precluded him from signing them, and at the same time he would be responsible for the whole of the liabilities. I told him I had no objection; he then arranged with the secretary about the old scrip, and paid a check in as deposit.

20148. Did he tell you this?—Mr. George Rennie told me that.

20149. That he had arranged with the secretary for the old scrip?—Yes, and paid a check for the deposit upon the amount of the new.

20150. Did Mr. Rennie tell you his reasons for not wishing to sign himself?—Yes, he stated it was more than probable he should be called in evidence to support the direct line in Committee, and that there would be a technical objection raised against him.

20151. Do you know Mr. James Rennie?—I know his name, and I have seen him; he is the brother of Mr. George Rennie.

20152. Is he concerned with Mr. George Rennie?—No.

20153. Mr. *C. Lushington.*] Is Mr. George Rennie professionally connected with the company?—He is partner with Sir John, but he has nothing to do with the direct line.

Mr. *George Lewin.*

20 May 1837.

20154. Mr. *Rowe.*] He is a partner with Sir John Rennie?—Yes.

20155. And Sir John Rennie is the engineer to the Brighton?—Yes.

20156. That was the reason given, *quantum valeat*, by Mr. George Rennie?—Yes.

20157. When you went to Mr. Dean, you say Mr. Dean was aware what you came for?—Yes.

20158. In point of fact, you presented no white scrip to Mr. Dean, and paid no money?—No, I did not.

20159. You signed the deed?—Yes.

20160. And procured the blue scrip in exchange?—It was afterwards sent to the office.

20161. There was nothing given to you?—There was a certificate given; I had signed for so many shares, and the shares were afterwards sent to me.

20162. The blue scrip?—The scrip receipts.

20163. Have you handed them over to Mr. Rennie?—No, certainly not; I hold them in trust for Mr. Rennie.

20164. Have you given Mr. Rennie any writing to that effect?—No, merely my word; a verbal declaration.

20165. Have you given any declaration of trust?—No, certainly not.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

20166. I dare say Mr. Rennie is aware in equity he would be liable if he signed the deed?—Yes.

20167. Is Mr. George Rennie a gentleman of substance and respectability?—Yes.

20168. Do you believe, when he told you he would be responsible, he spoke the truth and would be responsible for you?—Yes.

20169. He is a gentleman of honour?—Yes, he is.

20170. And does not pry into other people's affairs?—He does not.

20171. Did you understand from Mr. Rennie that the intermediate arrangement of handing over the white scrip and paying the deposit had been done before you signed the deed, and when you signed the deed the blue scrip would be forwarded to you?—Most certainly I did.

20172. Is Mr. Rennie a competent person for the amount of your subscription?—Decidedly so.

20173. He is not at a discount in the market?—I should think not.

Re-examined by Mr. *Rowe.*

20174. At the risk of the imputation of prying into other people's affairs, are you aware you made yourself legally liable by signing that deed?—Yes; and I am aware that I have sufficient funds to meet that liability.

20175. Were you aware of the liability at the time you signed the deed?—Yes, I was perfectly aware of it, and signed it with that knowledge.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Robert Lowe*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *Robert Lowe.*

20176. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the party whose name appears upon Rennie's deed in this way, "Robert Lowe, 7, Albion-place, gentleman, 50 shares, 3,750 *l.*"?—Yes, I am; I have removed to No. 6.

20177. Can you recollect when you signed for these shares?—I think it was in the middle of December.

20178. Were you at that time in the employ of Mr. Rennie as a clerk?—Yes.

20179. Which Mr. Rennie?—The Messrs. Rennie, both.

20180. Do you mean Sir John and Mr. George?—Yes, the partners.

20181. Who are the partners?—Sir John Rennie and Mr. George Rennie.

20182. At whose request, if at the request of any one, did you sign?—I was asked.

20183. By whom?—Mr. George Rennie.

20184. In consequence of that did you go to the Poultry?—I did.

20185. Did you tender any white scrip at that time?—No, I did not.

20186. Did you pay any money?—I did not.

20187. Who did you see?—I saw Mr. Dean, the secretary.

20188. Was any one with him?—I do not recollect.

Mr. Robert Lowe.

20 May 1837.

20189. Was it the board-room?—It was.

20190. Did you tell Mr. Dean you came to sign that deed?—Yes.

20191. Did Mr. Dean object?—No.

20192. He allowed you to sign?—Yes.

20193. Are you aware that any arrangements had taken place that induced Mr. Dean to let you sign the deed?—I do not know.

20194. Did Mr. Dean deliver to you in return, any blue certificates?—Yes, he did.

20195. What did you do with it?—Gave it back to Mr. Rennie.

20196. Have they been in your possession since?—Yes, they have.

20197. They were returned to you?—Yes.

20198. When was it?—Two or three days after.

20199. When they were returned to you, do you know why they were returned?—No, I do not; merely because I had signed the deed.

20200. Do you mean to say, you signed the deed on your own account?—Yes, with this understanding, I hold the shares in trust for Mr. Rennie.

20201. I want to know when this communication was made to you?—Previous to my signing the deed.

20202. Mr. Rennie told you so?—Yes.

20203. Were you aware at the time you were incurring a legal liability to this amount?—Yes, certainly I was.

20204. I do not wish to put any offensive question to you, but supposing no funds were supplied from any other source, were you capable of meeting the demand of 3,750 *l.*—Yes, I could meet it.

20205. Could you, at the time you signed the deed, have met from your own resources the demand of 3,750 *l.*?—Yes, I could.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

20206. Did not Mr. Rennie tell you he had paid the deposit and sent the white scrip before you went to sign, and that you would be allowed to sign when you went to the office?—Yes, I understood that.

20207. Did you understand it from Mr. George Rennie?—Yes.

20208. Did you understand what his reason was for wishing you to sign instead of him?—Yes.

20209. State what his reason was?—That I believe there was a technical objection to his signing the deed, and for this reason, that he might be called upon to give engineering evidence upon the bill. Last year Mr. Rennie signed the deed for 100 shares, and he was precluded giving evidence before the Committee on that account.

20210. *Chairman.*] Did Mr. George Rennie state that to you as a reason for his not signing the deed himself?—Yes.

20211. Mr. *Alexander.*] Did he also state to you he would take upon himself any responsibility attaching upon the shares?—Yes.

20212. Do you believe he is a man of such honour as to act up to that?—Yes, I do.

20213. Do you believe he is a man of substance, and able to act up to it?—Certainly.

20214. Independently of that, are you able to meet it yourself?—Yes, I am.

Re-examined by Mr. *Rowe.*

20215. Have inquiries been directed to you upon this subject before you came here?—I have received an order.

20216. Have not inquiries been made to ascertain upon what ground you hold these shares?—No, I am not aware of any inquiries made.

20217. No application has been made to you?—No; as soon as I received the order I attended; I received it on Friday.

20218. Was any application made to you?—No, none whatever.

20219. Do you know whether any was made to Mr. Lewin?—I am sure I do not know.

20220. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You have been brought here upon pure speculation, without being asked how you came to sign the deed?—No, I have not been brought here upon speculation.

20221. You have not had any inquiry made of you, as to the circumstances under which you signed the deed, though you received a summons to appear here;

here; no inquiry from the gentlemen connected with Stephenson's line?—No; exactly so. Mr. *Robert Lowe.* 20 May 1837.

20222. As far as those persons go, has the production of you and your evidence been a subject of speculation, as far as you know?—I do not know whether they speculated upon it.

20223. Mr. *Rowe.*] Have you not stated you signed the deed for Mr. Rennie?—Yes.

20224. Mr. *C. Lushington.*] What is your age?—I am in my 23d year.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Clarkson* delivered in documents, numbered from 1 to 12 inclusive, pursuant to the order of the Committee.

Lunæ, 22° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Chalmers.	Henry Warburton, Esq.
Mr. Forster.	

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Charles Billett, was called in; and Examined, as follows: *Charles Billett.* 22 May 1837.

20225. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the person whose name appears upon Rennie's list, "Charles Billett, Manor-place, Walworth, gentleman, twenty shares, 1,500*l.*?"—The same.

20226. Can you tell me when you signed that deed?—When the second call was made on the shares.

20227. Can you recollect about what month it was?—About three months ago; I am not certain at all; it did not interest me by any means, as I can explain to you.

20228. Explain to me how it was it did not interest you?—I am clerk to Mr. John Mathey.

20229. Is he a stockbroker?—He is; he was the holder of twenty shares in Rennie's Brighton line, and I believe it was the last day of the call.

20230. The last day of the limit?—Yes; and he sent me with a cheque (I believe it was a cheque) to pay the call, and I went and tendered the money, and was told I should sign.

20231. Where did you go to?—To the office in the Poultry.

20232. You took the cheque with you?—Yes.

20233. Did you take the old scrip with you?—Yes.

20234. The white scrip?—Yes, I believe it was.

20235. Do you know who it was you saw there?—No, I do not at all; they may have thought I was the holder of it.

20236. Should you know the person you saw?—Possibly I might; I believe it was the secretary, but I did not sign in the secretary's presence; I did not sign in the room where he was.

20237. Did you see him?—Yes; I saw him afterwards.

20238. Where did you go first?—I went into the room upon the left, the clerk's office; I there paid the money, and was told I should sign the deed, which I did, and a scrap of paper was delivered to me, which I took to the secretary's office, and he gave me the new scrip.

20239. Did the secretary ask any questions of you who you were?—Not at all.

20240. Or where you came from?—No; the paper I carried I suppose was quite sufficient.

20241. Did any one else ask you anything?—No.

20242. *Chairman.*] What was the nature of the paper you took to the secretary?—I think the number of shares, and the amount of the second call received on it; I do not think there was anything else.

20243. Mr. *Rowe.*] Have you any interest at all in those shares yourself?—Not the slightest.

Charles Billett.

22 May 1837.

20244. At that time were you able to meet the demand of 1,500*l.* yourself?—It is an impossible thing for it to be called for.

20245. Supposing at that time you had been called upon to pay that 1,500*l.*, could you have met it from your own resources?—No, certainly not; I should not have signed it if there had been any such possibility.

20246. At the time you signed this deed were you aware you were making yourself liable for that 1,500*l.*?—I thought that the gentlemen I lived with would have taken the responsibility if there was any, but I should not have been afraid of it myself.

20247. I believe, without going into your domestic affairs too much, you are not a housekeeper, you live with your father?—No; I keep a house and am married, and have two children.

20248. Are you still a clerk at Mr. Mathey's?—Yes.

20249. That is your principal income what you derive from your emoluments as clerk?—Yes.

20250. What did you do with the blue scrip you got?—I delivered it to Mr. Mathey immediately.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

20251. Is Mr. Mathey a gentleman of substance and respectability?—I believe he is.

20252. My learned friend has asked you if you could pay 1,500*l.* if you were asked for it at any time; did you ever know that shares were usually paid off at once?—No; I never heard of it before.

20253. They are usually paid in calls?—Yes.

20254. Which is the way they have been called for in Stephenson's line?—Yes.

20255. You did not understand that the signing of the deed made you liable to the payment of that amount immediately?—No; and if anybody had told me so I should have laughed at it.

20256. *Chairman.*] Were you able to pay it by instalments if the whole was called for in five years?—I cannot tell what might happen in the course of five years; if they had called for 20*l.* I could have paid it of course.

20257. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you any doubt of the probity and honour of your employer, that he would hold you harmless upon those shares?—No doubt of it.

20258. And he is competent as well as willing?—Yes.

20259. Mr. *Forster.*] Did any document pass between you and Mr. Mathey upon the subject of those shares?—No; I have lived with him ten years.

20260. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You have a perfect reliance upon his honour and integrity?—Yes.

20261. Do you know whether Mr. Mathey has the blue scrip now?—I am not certain; he might have since sold it: it has not been in my possession.

Re-examined by Mr. *Rowe.*

20262. You say you paid a cheque; was it for one pound a share, as a deposit?—Yes, as far as I recollect, it was; it was not the deposit, it was the second call.

20263. Did any one at the office inform you, you would be liable to be called upon for another half of another call of 2*l.*?—I do not know that they did.

20264. Were you aware of it?—I might have been, but I should not pay attention to it, as a circumstance to recollect it after a lapse of time.

20265. Did you ever hear you were liable for a half of another call of 2*l.*?—No; I do not think I heard it.

20266. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You did not read the advertisement?—Perhaps I did; but there are so many advertisements for railroads, I cannot recollect.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Rowe* now proposed to call Mr. *Dean.*

Mr. *Clarkson* inquired of Mr. *Rowe* whether he had any other witnesses to call in addition to Mr. *Dean.*

Mr. *Rowe* replied in the affirmative, that he had other witnesses to call.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, it would be more convenient that the cross-examination of Mr. *Dean* should be postponed till all those other witnesses had been examined.

Mr.

Mr. *Rowe* objected to the cross-examination of Mr. *Dean* being postponed, and insisted that the cross-examination should follow on the closing of the examination in chief. *Charles Billett.* 22 May 1237.

The *Committee* decided that the cross-examination of Mr. *Dean* must follow the examination in chief, if it was insisted upon by the other side.

William Cook, was again called in; and further Examined, as follows:

William Cook.

20267. Mr. *Rowe.*] YOU are a messenger to this House?—Yes.

20268. Did you serve a summons on Charles Moring, on Saturday, at 7, Ferdinand-place, Hampstead-road?—No; I found him at the Auction Mart Coffee-house.

20269. Did he admit himself to be the party?—Yes.

20270. Did you require his attendance here to-day?—No, on Saturday; he read the order, and he said he would be here on Saturday.

20271. Was he here?—I do not know.

20272. With regard to Richard Blackmore, did you apply to him also?—Yes.

20273. Where did you find him?—At the Auction Mart Coffee-house.

20274. Did he admit he was the party summoned?—Yes.

20275. Did you require his attendance here?—Yes.

20276. What did he say?—That he could not possibly come on Saturday, but he would attend on Monday, and he would send an explanation by the other man.

[The Witness withdrew.

Thomas Ford, was called in; and Examined, as follows

Thomas Ford.

20277. Mr. *Rowe.*] DID you serve a man called John Fielding, of 51, Paddington-street?—Yes.

20278. With the order of the House?—Yes.

20279. When was it?—It was last Thursday.

20280. What happened?—It was taken up to his dinner table.

20281. Did you see him?—No; I sent up to him, and he would not come down.

20282. Have you been there since?—Yes; and he has gone out of town.

20283. Was that the answer?—Yes.

20284. Have you ever seen him at all?—No.

20285. To whom did you deliver the summons?—To the servant; and I was at the foot of the stairs when she went up.

20286. Did you send up word you wanted to see him?—Yes; and the answer was that he was at dinner, and could not be disturbed.

20287. The next time did you ask anything about the summons?—I saw the daughter yesterday, and she said the summons was burnt, and he had nothing to do with railroads at all; that he thought he would not attend, and had destroyed the summons.

20288. Did she say he had had it?—Yes.

20289. And she said he was out of town?—Yes; he was gone out of town.

20290. What name did the daughter give him. Did the servant say that John Fielding lived in that house?—Yes.

20291. The daughter herself admitted the father was called John Fielding?—Yes, she did.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Henry Dean*, was again called in; and further Examined, as follows:

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

20292. Mr. *Rowe.*] SINCE I had the pleasure of seeing you last, these documents have been delivered in, and I want to ask you a few questions about them. These are the prospectuses that have been put in; the one I hold in my hand is that of the original company. Capital, 800,000*l.*?—Yes.

20293. I do not see that this first prospectus gives the names of the original directors; it gives the provisional committee. Are those the directors of the original company?—No; the directors were Sir William Jolliffe, Grant Allan, jun.

20294. You mean to say that the provisional committee does not constitute the body of directors?—There were some that were not directors.

20295. Who else?—Charles Sedgfield Crowley, John Harman, Robert Sutton, jun., Jonathan Thorpe, Matthias Wilkes, Joseph Brown Wilkes.

20296. Those were the original directors?—Yes.

 20297. Have

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

22 May 1837.

20297. Have the goodness to tell me the names of the directors since the formation of what we have been calling the new company?—There is Sir William Jolliffe.

20298. This other prospectus you have handed in, No. 3, does not give the new directors?—No; it is merely a statement of what the directors wanted to make known to the public; it does not contain the names of the directors.

20299. Now the names of the new directors?—Sir William Jolliffe, John Harman, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, Benjamin Davis, Robert Sutton, jun. Joseph Brown Wilkes, Richard Heaviside, Thomas Sinclair Robinson, Matthias Wilkes; ten, I think, altogether.

20300. Mr. Allan and Mr. Thorpe appear to have gone out of the directory?—Yes; they have.

20301. No; there are but nine?—James Swabey I omitted.

20302. You were good enough, in the course of your examination before, to say you thought that you could give us the number of the persons who signed the second deed at the bankers'; you have made no return to that effect?—The number of shares subscribed for I can tell you, but not the number of persons.

20303. That is what I mean, the number of shares taken at the bankers'?—The number of shares subscribed for up to the first limit, the 15th of November, was 2,062 at Messrs. Hankey's; 140 in the country, Manchester and Liverpool; 266 at Brighton, and 30 were paid upon at the office of the solicitor by a gentleman who was going out of town in the morning, and that makes 2,498 up to the 15th of November.

20304. Between the 12th and 15th of November?—Yes.

20305. *Chairman.*] Is that the number of shares upon which the 1*l.* deposit was paid?—Yes, up to the 15th of November.

20306. Mr. *Rowe.*] I think you told us, upon the construction of the original company, all the shares were subscribed for at the bankers'?—Yes; I think they were, there might be one or two who did not.

20307. Have you refreshed your memory in regard to the allotments made in the original company; have you looked at the allotment book?—Yes.

20308. And the names of the parties who signed the deed?—Yes.

20309. Are you able to say now, having looked at the names of the parties who signed the deed, and the names of the parties to whom shares were allotted, that they are the same parties?—To the best of my knowledge they are; I know of no difference.

20310. You know of no case where shares were allotted to one party, and before the deed was signed they passed into the hands of third parties?—No.

20311. That was the original allotment?—Yes, of the old company.

20312. There was no allotment in the new company?—No.

20313. Have you, from any information you have obtained since you were here last, been able to ascertain the number of shares subscribed for up to the 11th of January?—I have drawn it out as near as I can ascertain it, there being no date to the signatures; I make it 3,230 between the 15th of November and the 11th of January.

20314. You mean between the 15th of November and the 11th of January 3,230 were subscribed for?—Yes

20315. That is, in addition to the 2,450?—Yes; precisely so.

20316. Are you able to inform the Committee how many were subscribed for between the 11th of January and the 18th, which would be the limit; the 11th is the day you published your advertisement that persons must come in and exchange their certificates, and everything afterwards would be null and void?—Yes.

20317. What is the number?—Between the 11th and 18th inclusive, the number was about 4,500.

20318. *Chairman.*] Then there were others subsequent to the 18th of January?—Up to the 2d of February; from the 19th of January, as near as I can draw it out, the number was 3,200, which includes the directors.

20319. Mr. *Rowe.*] That would be between the 18th exclusive and the 2d of February?—Yes. I have made a Return to the Committee of the same parties who have signed the deed since the 2d of February; from the 2d of February to the 24th of April there is about 1,200. I make it 14,628.

20320. I am holding in my hand a copy of the Return No. 12; a Return of the names of the subscribers entered in the cash book; who entered their names as subscribers,

subscribers, and who paid their deposits upon their subscription after the 2d of February 1837?—Yes.

20321. The names and the sums have been given already in the body of the evidence?—Yes.

20322. I find in your evidence, which you gave on the 11th of May, the same names and the sums carried out, and I find that those sums as added up, I believe by yourself, amount to 119,850*l.*?—Just so.

20323. I believe if that sum is divided by 75 it will give 1,598 shares?—I dare say it would.

20324. Have any of the parties added their names to the subscription list since the 24th of April?—Yes; they have.

20325. Can you give me the names of those, and how many there are since the 24th of April?—There are fifteen shares since the 24th of April.

20326. Putting those two sums together, that will give us 1,215 shares between the 2d of February and the present time?—Exactly.

20327. That being so, will you have the goodness to account for the discrepancy between that statement and this Return; because, according to the Return, the number of shares subscribed for between the 2d of February and this time is 1,598?—I have stated, as I went on, I did not bind myself to a few figures, but there are a few names in this Return I wish to explain; they paid the money and lodged the old scrip a long time ago, but it was inconvenient to them to come to town to sign the deed; three of them are in that position on that list, and it was considered by me that that subscription was a positive one, and when I made this memorandum there was not a new subscription since the 2d of February, though they had signed the deed since the 2d of February.

20328. Now to go by steps, we will take those names. The difference is considerable between the 1,215 and 1,298?—Yes; but I did not bind myself to a figure as I went on.

20329. But it is a considerable difference?—Yes; but the sum total remains the same.

20330. *Chairman.*] You mean to say a portion of those 1,598 is included in the previous number, either of the 4,500 or the 3,200?—No; the numbers I have read from this paper are such as I have made out partly from figures and partly from memory; but what I mean to explain to the Committee, as to the three parties on the list, is this, that those parties long ago paid their subscription and sent their old scrip up to London; but the same parties who brought the scrip to me before did not come to sign the deed till after the 2d of February.

20331. Mr. *Rowe.*] Shall I be right in taking it so, that the Return is correct in point of fact, and that the parties did sign after the 2d of February?—Yes.

20332. Give me the names of those three parties?—Melville.

20333. Who else?—Elliman, and Taylor, the last man.

20334. That is your explanation?—Yes, of those three.

20335. Now if I am correct in my figures, you will find that those sums you have given, Melville's 2,200*l.*, Elliman's 375*l.*, and Taylor's 750*l.*; I believe if I am correct in my figures, that that amounts to no more than forty-five shares?—I dare say that they do.

20336. If I deduct those forty-five shares from the Return, will the Return then be accurate?—Certainly; it is accurate as it stands.

20337. That would leave 1,553 shares which have been subscribed for, according to the Return, between the 2d of February and the present time?—Yes.

20338. Now explain the discrepancy between that and 1,215?—I have stated that without this memorandum, partly by recollecting the present subscribers; I call it 1,200; if we have given a return of 1,215 it is correct.

20339. Then am I to understand that your memory is so incorrect that you make a difference of 300 shares?—I did not compare your Return with the sum total of the shares given in; if I had done that I should have made this quite tally, and it was quite in my power to do so.

20340. Do you not think it rather a loose way of giving information, after having had ample time to furnish yourself with particulars, that you make a difference of 300 shares, each share standing for 75*l.*; is not that a considerable variance?—No; I do not think this has anything to do with it. I have been busying myself in making those Returns with the assistance of others, and I believe them to be correct; this paper I have here I had only commenced just before

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

22 May 1837.

before I came here, for I only just recollected it. With respect to that done at the bankers', it is accurate to a share; with respect to those taken from the deed, as some paid at the time and did not subscribe, I have divided it as nearly as I possibly could from recollection; I have put down the 1,200 from the 2d of April.

20341. There being this admitted inaccuracy between February and the present day, will you tell me if the rest of your recollection, excepting the shares derived from the bankers, is equally inaccurate?—It is very possible that it might be if it could be analysed, but it is impossible to do it.

20342. We will endeavour to analyse it a little further; have the goodness to call for your cash book. [*The cash book was produced.*] Have the goodness to refer to it, and are you able to tell within a few days the time at which the party must have signed the deed?—Yes, I think I could, with the exception of some of those cases of parties who paid their money long ago, when it was paid to me, or when they came two or three months afterwards to sign the deed.

20343. Now then, going backwards from the 2d of February, let us take the period of time between the 18th of January and the 2d of February; you told me between the 18th of January and the 2d of February there were only 3,200 shares subscribed?—About that, as near as I can gather.

20344. Now allow me to remind you, you stated in your evidence that Poulton signed the deed the 18th of January?—Yes.

20345. And you also stated that the signature followed the ordinary course, that is to say, that one man wrote his name down, and then another man wrote his name down?—Yes.

20346. Referring to the share list, and seeing the large sums that appear subscribed after Poulton's subscription on the 18th of January, do you still adhere to your answer?—Yes, I have no doubt of it; I have no doubt that every name who appears after Poulton certainly signed after Poulton.

20347. *Chairman.*] And Poulton signed the 18th?—Yes.

20348. That subscription of 510 shares by Poulton would be included in the 4,500 *l.*?—Yes.

20349. Was Warner signed the 18th or the 19th?—The 18th.

20350. Which was the first name signed after the 18th?—That is where I am puzzled in dividing the thing.

20351. Mr. *Rowe.*] Look at your cash book?—I am sure I cannot tell who was the last man that signed the 18th.

20352. Look at the cash paid in on the 18th?—The cash received the 18th would be paid in on the 19th, and the last name in this cash book on the 19th is the name of Olney.

20353. *Chairman.*] £. 3,750?—But the cash book would not show it. The second name after his on the cash book is Poulton; they do not come in in the order in which they stand on the deed, as they paid their scrip.

20354. Mr. *Rowe.*] You have mentioned Poulton's name as appearing there; have the goodness to tell me for what sum?—On the book he appears, on the 21st, as having paid into the bankers', not to me, 110 *l.*; and then, on the 13th of February, 400 *l.*; making 510 *l.*; for which he signed the deed the 18th of January.

20355. Is he in juxtaposition with Olney in the cash book?—Poulton stands next but one to Olney in this book.

20356. *Chairman.*] What date is it?—19th of January.

20357. When does he appear for 400 *l.*?—The 13th of February.

20358. Mr. *Rowe.*] From that you conclude that Olney was the last name who signed the deed the 18th?—No, I do not.

20359. Can you answer the question now?—No, I cannot; I do not think it is possible, as to who was the last man that signed the deed; there is no mark on the deed, and I should be rather reluctant to answer if I am to be tied down to figures; I had rather say I cannot tell.

20360. As near as you can say?—There is nothing to guide me, and I cannot by possibility say who was the last person that signed the deed on any particular day.

20361. Then if that be so, tell me from what calculation you have made that statement?—I have done it in the best way I could.

20362. In making that statement, tell me the pains you have taken in drawing out that statement as to the last man who signed on the 18th, and the first man

man on the 19th?—I took no pains at all; I took the date, I think, from looking at the cash book, but that would not be the rule.

20363. Then, having stated between the 18th of January and the 2d of February 3,200 shares were subscribed for, tell me the point of the deed you refer to?—No point at all; it was from the cash book.

20364. From what point in the cash book?—The date in the cash book.

20365. Tell me the date; I want to verify your statement?—

Chairman.] Which is the first name in the printed list included in that 3,200 shares.

Witness.] From the 18th of January, would begin on the 19th, and where there is one of the names.

20366. You must have determined in your own mind upon some name with which to begin in making to us that statement of 3,200?—Yes.

20367. In making that calculation of 3,200, what was the name you began with?—I can scarcely call it a calculation I made; but the first name on the cash book on the 19th of January is a man of the name of Houghton, but that would not answer the question, or lead to its being answered, because a very large part of the subscriptions paid to me on the 18th were paid in after banking hours, and did not go in till the 19th, and they appear here on the 19th, but I cannot separate them.

20368. Mr. *Rowe.*] You must have started from some point; what was the point you started from?—Upon my honour I cannot tell you; I took the figures, not the names, in making that rough memorandum, and that memorandum is as near as I can make it.

20369. I want to know from what point in the account you started; any date, or any name, you like?—I took it after the 2d of February; from the names——

20370. That is not the point; if you will direct your attention to the point of time from the 18th of January to the 2d of February?—From the 18th of January to the 2d of February it would end with the name of James Lawson; but I cannot tell, without adding it up backwards, where I began.

20371. I want to know where you began?—With respect to the memorandum I looked at the names here, and, as far as they were applicable, I put them on a scrap of paper; but with respect to others, there were others who had paid, but had not subscribed the deed.

20372. Do you mean to say that no weight can be attached to the statement you have given?—Yes, this division I have made; it is a rough sort of thing as can be made as to the shares, as to a great many; I have done it partly by referring to the book, and partly by a recollection of the cases.

20373. If you mean your statement is to be taken for anything, can you inform the Committee, in apportioning those names, from what name you began from; any source of information you please, tell us whom you included, and whom you have excluded?—I do not think I could do any such thing.

20374. If I was to suggest to you any date, you will find the directors themselves, between the 18th of January and 2d of February, appear to have signed for something like 2,000 shares, to say nothing of all the others; should you be inclined to think that your statement of the whole, amounting to 2,300, was inaccurate?—No; I should not think it so, or I should not have stated it.

20375. Have you not said that the large sum subscribed by the directors was subscribed on the 28th of January?—Yes, I think I did.

20376. When I tell you that those sums amount to 2,000 shares, to say nothing as to other subscribers, can you have any doubt that the statement you have made this morning is inaccurate?—Without referring to the deed I cannot tell; but I may say this, which will come to the point as near as possible, that, with the exception of the directors, nobody was allowed to exchange scrip after the 18th but the directors, except in special cases, and those special cases did not exceed above eleven or twelve hundred.

20377. Have the goodness to refer to the deed, and taking the directors to have subscribed for 2,000 shares, and looking at the other names, have you any doubt the statement you have made to-day is grossly inaccurate? [*The Witness referred to the deed.*]—I can give you the number of shares accurately, I think, subscribed for since the 18th of January up to now.

20378. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you mean that that is to be more than inclusive of the printed list, or only inclusive?—That is my difficulty, I cannot separate them; a part

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

22 May 1837.

a part of the names will be in the printed list, and will contain all those subscribed up to the 2d of February; but I cannot tell what person in particular signed the deed before the 2d of February or after the 2d of February; I can tell you the whole number who have subscribed since the limit, and that amounts to 3,308.

20379. *Chairman.*] Then all the shares, inclusive of Mr. Olney down to the end of the deed, are 3,711, so that you must go probably a little before Mr. Olney to find where the 19th begins?—I have given you the sum total of those who had subscribed that day; the printed list does not contain all of them, some have signed since it was deposited; about four names have subscribed after Mr. Olney's. Before I begin, I take William Mackay, I think he was the first of them on the 19th; I think that from my attention having been particularly called to that person very recently.

20380. Mr. *Rowe.*] You think William Mackay is the first after the 18th?—Yes. If you will be pleased to wait a moment, I am just reminded of a circumstance which I am very glad of, for I should wish to be accurate; I have made a statement of the name of William Mackay, but I have been reminded that he made an application to me on the 19th, but he did not sign till the 25th of January.

20381. Then you must go further back?—But I have not got any other land-mark.

20382. Have you not the land-mark of Poulton on the 18th?—Plenty of people signed after Poulton, I dare say, but I do not know how many.

20383. I want to know the reason you have for daring to say ——

The *Chairman* suggested that a return would be the best mode of obtaining this information.

20384. Will you have the goodness to give me, at your leisure, the number of shares signed for between the 18th of January and the 2d of February?—

The Witness stated he would furnish the information required at a future time.

20385. You were good enough to say you would let me look at the blue talon book?—It was brought here.

[*It was handed to Mr. Rowe.*]

20386. I take for granted that the number of shares subscribed for at the bankers' is accurate, as you have stated it?—I will make a return of the whole, from the beginning to the end, in the most correct way I can.

20387. Is this the way in which your talon is generally filled in; I see some instances in which it is simply filled up with the name. Talon No. 80 appears to have been delivered to John Haley, a man we have heard about; there is no residence put to it?—We have not time to do it there; we do not fill it up there, we take it from the deed afterwards, that was done in the white scrip.

20388. I want you to point me out any of the blue talons that are filled up with the residence?—There is not one, and will not be till the clerks have time; the talon is filled up from the deed.

20389. I put this question to you; suppose a party signs the deed who is not the party who takes the blue scrip, how would the talon be filled up?—It would be in the name of the party who signs the deed.

20390. Would the name of the party who took the scrip appear anywhere?—The person who signed the deed would be the man, if he signed at once; but if he came to sign the deed, and lodged his old scrip and did not take the new scrip, but came afterwards for it, (if he came afterwards and paid the money,) I should fill it up with the name on the deed.

20391. Point me out any case which is filled up in the way in which you meant to conduct your business?—They all are.

20392. I will begin with No. 1, here is a name here; No. 2 is blank, 4 blank, and 5 blank. Is this a spare book, or have those numbers been given out as scrip to the parties?—Tell me how many blanks there are, and I will explain it to you.

20393. On No. 1 there is the name of Faithful, and no other name of any kind.

20394. *Chairman.*] How many shares does each talon go for?—Five; there are a few for one share each. I will explain it; Mr. Faithful I will suppose took seventy-five shares in fives, that would be fifteen certificates, but we only enter the name on the first, and we commence the second person's shares where he left

left off; I do not know how many ones he took to make up his number, but that is the way in which they would be entered.

20395. Mr. *Rowe.*] Have the goodness to point out anything you suppose will be a check upon the party; I want to know if any entry is made upon the talon at the time it was cut off?—That is the number of the bankers' receipt, and the name of the party having the receipt.

20396. I do not find the number?—That is it, No. 2.

20397. Was the name entered on this talon from the bankers' receipt, or from the deed?—From the bankers' receipt, if he brought it; but when any party came to me and signed the deed, if he paid the money at the time, I made out the receipt; for the course of business was, that for the old scrip and 1*l.* per share he had the new scrip; I made out the receipt, and he endorsed his name on the back of the receipt, to show he was the party to receive the scrip.

20398. Would the bankers' receipt be any guide as to the time of signing the deed, that is what I am driving at; if you look to the receipt that will give you the date?—That would not enable me to make out anything like the return you are driving at, as you term it; because, when parties sent to me their old scrip and the money from the country, I immediately gave them a receipt.

20399. I am speaking of the London subscribers, not country subscribers?—I will make it out in the best possible way I can.

20400. Will you allow me to refer you to another return; I find entered in one of the returns the number of subscribers to the Parliamentary contract thus, "Number of subscribers, 274"?—Yes.

20401. You speak of the number of subscribers to the Parliamentary contract; does that go further than the time of depositing the deed?—It goes up to now; it begins and goes up to the present time, with the exception of those fifteen shares subscribed a few days ago.

20402. I find in another return this number, "The number of depositors, 216;" does that go from the commencement of the new company to the present time?—Yes; I fancy it does, I should say so.

20403. From the first name put to the new deed, down to the present time, all are included in the 274?—Yes.

20404. *Chairman.*] And the amount subscribed for up to the present time?—Yes, with the exception of fifteen shares.

20405. Mr. *Rowe.*] Should not each of those subscribers have been *bonâ fide* a depositor, according to your practice?—Yes, certainly; I should think so, if I understand the question at all.

20406. You have told us that your practice was, that a man brought the white scrip, signed the deed, and paid the money, and got the new scrip?—I did not always do that, but that was my practice, it was the general rule.

20407. That being so, every party who became a subscriber to the deed ought to be a depositor to a certain amount?—Yes; certainly.

20408. If you will refer to another return, you will find the number of depositors returned as 216?—Where is that? [*The return was handed to the Witness.*] This is the list of persons who have paid deposits, with the deposits paid by them respectively, on the day of depositing the Parliamentary contract; that is the 2d of February.

20409. Then am I to understand that the number of depositors is limited to those who had paid their deposits at the time of the deposit of the deed?—That is a list of the persons who had paid the deposits, with the deposits paid by them respectively, on the day of the deposit of the deed in the Private Bill Office.

20410. The return of the subscribers is from the first name on the deed down to the present day, and the return of the depositors is only down to the 2d of February?—Yes; that is so.

20411. Now, I hold in my hand two returns, one is a return of the subscribers who have entered their names before the 2d of February, but who have paid their deposits since the 2nd of February, and the names on that return are only fifteen. I hold in my hand another return, in which I find a return of the names of the subscribers entered in the cash book who entered their names as subscribers, and paid their deposits on the subscription, after the 2d of February 1837, on which there are twenty names, which would make thirty-five altogether who had deposited since the 2d of February?—There is a name which has been omitted in this list, which I will ask to be inserted; he signed the deed before, but paid afterwards; that is the name of William Peters.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

22 May 1837.

20412. To what amount?—£. 35.

20413. That will make, instead of thirty-five, thirty-six parties who have deposited since the 2d of February?—Yes.

20414. If you subtract 216 from 274, you will find that it leaves fifty-eight, so that there would be, according to that return, fifty-eight parties who had deposited since the 2d of February, and I find by your return there are only thirty-six.

20415. *Chairman.*] There would be 216 depositors on the 2d of February, and thirty-six, since that date, would make 252; the number who have signed the deed is 274, and that would leave a certain number who have paid no deposits.

Mr. *Rowe.*] Yes, just so; that would leave twenty-two parties who had paid no deposits upon this railway to this day; is that so?—

Witness.] I have no doubt I could explain it, if I could call it to my mind.

The Witness was directed to furnish the information required at the next meeting of the Committee.

20416. Mr. *Rowe.*] In the Return No. 11, you have given me the names of the parties who have subscribed before the 2d of February, but who had not paid their deposits till after the 2d of February; the gross total of that is 3,342 shares, which, multiplied by 75 *l.*, will give 250,650 *l.*?—You must add the thirty-five shares for Mr. Peters, that will make 3,377 shares.

20417. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Will that alter the number of subscribers after the 2d February?—No; they are subscribers before the 2nd of February, but paid afterwards.

20418. *Chairman.*] That would alter the number of depositors to 215 instead of 216?—Yes.

20419. Mr. *Rowe.*] That being so, and giving altogether the sum of 253,275 *l.*, will you be kind enough to tell me whether a large majority of those deposits was not paid after the presentation of Mr. Till's petition against Rennie's line?—I am very certain that a very large portion were paid before.

20420. Now just look at your book, we will see how accurate you are upon that?—

The petition of Mr. Till appeared to have been presented on the 24th of April.

Witness.] I rather anticipated I should be asked this question, although it was not ordered as a return; and I have drawn out the names of those who paid before the 24th of April: "A list of persons who signed the deed previous to the 2d of February, and who paid the deposits thereon between that day and the 24th of April, 1,544 shares; the amount of 115,800 *l.*;" I call that a large proportion.

20421. Mr. *Rowe.*] Can you fix a positive day on which those payments were made?—No; I have fixed it within that period.

20422. Can you fix the date?—I can make it out from my book.

20423. And give the very day?—Yes, certainly.

[*The Witness was directed to furnish the information alluded to.*]

20424. You mentioned there was a sub-committee acting during some period of time while these matters were going on; a sub-committee of four, who sat every day shortly before the 18th of January?—Not a sub-committee; it was the board.

20425. You have stated, from the 18th, that committee were sitting every day; that there was a sub-committee consisting of four: will you tell me of what parties that sub-committee consisted; who were the gentlemen?—Do you refer to any particular day?

20426. Did they vary, or were they the same individuals?—No; it was a sub-committee of four, and three were a quorum.

20427. Will you give me the names of the four who constituted that committee?—Mr. Crowley, Mr. Harman, Mr. Robert Sutton, jun., and I have a doubt about the fourth. I think the fourth was Joseph Brown Wilks.

20428. You stated, in your examination, that Mr. Poulton's case, for instance, you had brought to the knowledge of some of the directors?—I think I stated that it was possible, or even probable. I might mention it to any one director who came in to my own room; but as I was very busy at the time I was in my

own

own room, I did not mention it in the board-room, I did not communicate it to them officially; but if they came into my room, I might have mentioned it.

20429. Have you any doubt that you mentioned it?—I think what I have stated will be found to be the substance of what I stated before.

20430. This question was put by Mr. Austin on the first day: "Did you ever make any statement to the directors of the fact of parties signing the deed without paying the whole of the deposit?" Your answer was, "I believe I did; I am sure I did. Poulton's case for instance? Yes." That being so, I only ask you whether you have any doubt you did make a communication to the directors, to more than one director, I do not say officially, that Poulton had signed the deed and had not paid the deposit?—I think, as I have just said, it is probable; to any director, who came into my room, I might have mentioned the circumstance.

20431. Having said on that occasion you were sure you did, will you say you doubt it now?—I very much doubt whether I did say I was sure of it.

20432. Have you any doubt about it, that you did communicate to the directors the fact, that Poulton had signed the deed and had not paid the money?—I have very great doubt about it as matter of certainty, certainly; but that I stated it to one is more than probable.

20433. Have you any doubt you communicated to them the case of more than one individual?—Yes; it is very possible that I did.

20434. Do you recollect the case of a person of the name of Mackay, who was examined here the second day of this inquiry?—Yes; I recollect him now.

20435. Do you recollect you were requested to come into the room, and that he fixed upon you as the person he had seen at the office?—Yes.

20436. Do you recollect whether you mentioned that case to the directors as a case where a party had signed, and not for himself, and that he told you so?—That has no relation to the question you just put to me before.

20437. Will you just answer it. Do you recollect whether you ever mentioned the case of the boy Mackay coming to sign, who told you he did not come to sign for himself, to the directors?—I am sure I never did.

20438. Did you ever refuse to receive scrip from a person named Mackay, because the day of forfeiture was passed?—Yes; I did to a person called Mackay.

20439. Do you recollect that person coming again, and the deed being signed, and the scrip being received?—Yes.

20440. Do you recollect his telling you he came to sign for other parties?—No; and if I had been asked the question without my mind being called to it, I should say it was in the highest degree improbable, if not impossible.

20441. Did you observe whether Mackay looked a person of mature age, or a boy?—No; I did not.

20442. Did you ever take that into consideration in allowing parties to sign the deed?—No.

20443. Am I to understand you put no questions to any party, however juvenile he might be?—I did not.

20444. You put no questions to any individual, although the amount he might have signed for was very considerable; for instance, in Mr. Carr's case?—No; I put no question to him whatever.

20445. Do you remember the name of Moxon being mentioned in regard to Mackay?—Yes.

20446. Do you remember whether it was not told you, he came to sign for a party in communication with Mr. Moxon, and not for himself?—No; to the best of my recollection I should say not. I think it impossible, if he had told me he came to sign for another person, that I could have let him sign.

20447. What did you hear upon the subject?—Nothing at all.

20448. You said you heard the name of Moxon mentioned?—Not by Mackay. Mr. Moxon's name has been brought to my recollection lately, as being one of the parties who applied to me to be allowed to exchange some scrip after the limit, that is to say, on the 19th of January. I laid that application before the directors; they considered that the circumstances were of so extraordinary a nature as to warrant them, in his case, of departing from the rule, and they desired me to exchange the scrip when it was brought. On the 25th of January, that is six days afterwards, a person, who I know now as Mackay, came to the office, and said he had come to sign for the scrip Mr. Moxon had written

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

22 May 1837.

written to the directors about, or to me about; and having received the directions of the directors to allow the scrip, about which Mr. Moxon had written, to be exchanged, he signed the deed in the presence of the clerk, and exchanged the old scrip, and paid the money.

20449. What were your directions from the directors?—Nothing more than that they complied with the request.

20450. What was the request?—I received some communication from Mr. Moxon; he had let the time go over; it was stated he was exceedingly ill, and the directors, under those circumstances, considered it right he should be permitted to come in and sign.

20451. Did Mr. Moxon write to you stating those circumstances, that he had been ill, and asking that he might come in and exchange his scrip?—Yes.

20452. You communicated it to the directors?—Yes.

20453. They determined that he might come in and exchange the scrip?—That the scrip about which he had written might be exchanged.

20454. Was it that he should exchange his scrip?—If I said his scrip, I said a good deal more than I know.

20455. *Chairman.*] You mean, to exchange scrip in his possession?—Yes, exactly so; that is the better way of putting it.

20456. Mr. *Rowe.*] Was it this way or that way?—To exchange scrip in his possession.

20457. Did Mr. Moxon, at the time he made the application, tell you that the scrip belonged to his clerk, a minor?—He did not tell me who it belonged to.

20458. After your attention had been called to this scrip, the scrip in his possession, and which he did not say was his own, did you afterwards allow a clerk, a minor, to sign in his own name?—That he was a minor appears now; I did not know it at that time; but that person came into my office a week after the transaction took place, between which times a great deal of business had occurred, and telling me he had come to sign for the scrip Mr. Moxon had written about, and I having received directions to let it be done, I told him to do it; I did not ask whether he was twenty-one.

20459. Did you ask whether his name was Moxon?—No; I was not to conclude they were Mr. Moxon's shares.

20460. When an application was made to you to sign this deed, did you ever make any application to the parties to know whether the shares belonged to them, or did you let any parties sign?—If any parties brought the old scrip and paid the money, I let them sign.

20461. *Chairman.*] Did you know Mr. Moxon's person?—I have seen him since, once; I did not know him then.

20462. Mr. *Rowe.*] Do you persist in the answer you gave upon the former occasion as to the mode in which the accounts were kept; that there was no balance of the accounts since the accounts were made up at the termination of the last session of Parliament?—No general balance.

20463. You adhere to that now?—Yes.

20464. The cash books and the other books were inspected from time to time as the directors pleased?—Yes, as they thought fit to ask for them.

20465. Have you any doubt that they were so inspected?—No, I have no doubt at all; I do not know the extent to which inspection is meant to go; sometimes they looked at them, I cannot say whether minutely or not.

20466. Do you doubt that the sub-committee, as the session of Parliament was approaching, looked to see how the subscription was going on?—As the session was approaching, the subscriptions were very large; I dare say that the directors did occasionally open the deeds, and see what signatures there were, and they might ask me the question, "how does the balance stand," and they got their information.

20467. Did they ever put any question whether the deposits had been paid or not?—I do not know that they did.

20468. Deposits to the amount of 400 *l.*?—I have said before, I think it probable I mentioned it myself to any director who came into the room, but not specially or particularly.

20469. I see here the name of Sir William Jolliffe, as having been a subscriber to the old deed for 120 shares, which would be 6,000 *l.* money?—Yes, 50 *l.* shares.

20470. In the new deed, sixty-five shares?—Yes, 75 *l.* each.

20471. Can

20471. Can you tell me, by referring to the book, whether any deposit was paid upon those sixty-five shares, and if so, when?—Yes [*the Witness referred to the cash book*]; it was paid into the bankers' the 9th of January.

20472. Is it by a cheque?—I do not know; he paid it in himself. No, that is wrong; it was long before; it was the 14th of November, 60 *l.*; and on the 9th of January 5 *l.*: two separate payments.

20473. Will you look at the name of Thomas Dann, immediately before Sir William Jolliffe; in the list I find him a subscriber for ten shares?—Thomas Dann, on the 19th of November, ten shares, 10 *l.*

20474. With regard to the directors, if I understand you rightly, who take these large sums, the 28th of January they deposited no white scrip?—No; they were shares taken as a portion of those that were forfeited, that were not brought in.

20475. They were supposed to be outstanding, or at any rate were not brought in?—They were outstanding.

20476. Was there any general meeting, or any board meeting, that authorized a transaction of that nature?—There was a board, no doubt, because all the directors no doubt were there.

20477. No general meeting of subscribers?—No.

20478. Was there a board meeting, which authorized the directors to do what they did?—There was a board meeting; they did not want any authority; it was done by their own authority.

20479. You mean, in point of fact, to represent, that those directors who had paid up their deposits, had paid 1 *l.* deposit, and no more?—Upon those shares.

20480. So that if the old scrip was valuable, the directors had not deposited the old scrip, nor the value of it?—They could do neither the one nor the other; they could not deposit the old scrip, because they had not got it, and they could not pay more than 1 *l.* upon it; it is a certificate, bearing the payment of 3 *l.* deposit: 2 *l.* has been paid, for which the white scrip is a certificate.

20481. Can you tell me any one director who paid the 2 *l.* upon the scrip so taken?—No; but the other parties had paid, and had allowed it to be forfeited.

20482. Can you point out any director who had paid sixpence more than 1 *l.* upon any of those shares?—No, certainly not.

20483. Was there any general meeting of subscribers to authorize it?—No.

20484. *Chairman.*] Is there any clause in the subscribers' agreement, which is commonly called the deed of settlement, empowering parties paying 1 *l.* deposit alone, without having any old scrip also, to stand upon the same footing with subscribers paying the 1 *l.* deposit, and possessing white scrip also?—I do not think there is; I am not aware that there is.

20485. Mr. *Rowe.*] We have heard, that although nominally the final term had expired the 18th, parties did subscribe after the 18th, and scrip was of some value; I do not say what?—Yes.

20486. You stated that yourself?—I did not state any value.

20487. You said it was of some value?—I do not recollect it.

20488. *Chairman.*] What was the number of shares taken by the directors on that occasion?—2,100.

20489. Mr. *Rowe.*] Supposing the white scrip to have been put at 2 *s.* 6 *d.*, would every director who paid the deposit of 1 *l.* per share be benefited individually to the amount of the then value of the white scrip?—I think that is putting the question very hypothetically; it was not with that supposition.

20490. Have you any doubt that the scrip was of some value?—I should say, in answer to that question, it was perfectly valueless, and persons in doors and persons out of doors knew that it was only permitted to be exchanged in special cases.

20491. In your opinion, it was perfectly valueless?—Yes.

20492. I need scarcely ask you if any consideration was paid by any director beyond the 1 *l.*, if the scrip was valueless?—No, nothing.

20493. Put it in this way; suppose an old subscriber, who had paid 2 *l.* upon the original scrip, had paid the other pound for the new, he would have got blue scrip?—Yes.

20494. And the directors would stand in the situation of that person, having only paid 1 *l.*?—A man who possesses the old scrip brings in the representative of 2 *l.*, and by adding 1 *l.*, he gets the scrip certifying that 3 *l.* had been paid; but those are certificates that did not represent old scrip; it may not have been in

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

22 May 1837.

in existence; it has never been brought in, and the company have had the benefit of that 2 *l.*; the directors took those shares and the liabilities attaching upon those shares.

20495. Can you tell me any instances of persons who have signed without producing old scrip?—No one; certainly not where new scrip has been given.

20496. Has every subscriber who has signed the deed since the 2d of February brought in old scrip?—Yes, every one except the directors; that is to say, except those who brought it in before.

20497. It comes to this, you have allowed no one to sign, except the directors, without the production of old scrip?—Certainly.

20498. You have told us, with regard to the white scrip, you allowed some parties not to pay the deposit, they leaving the white scrip in pledge?—Yes.

20499. Did you ever communicate to any of those parties that they were liable to the other moiety of that call of 1 *l.*?—I do not know that I have; it was done by public advertisement.

20500. Will you allow me to ask you what sort of pledge you consider it to be, when you say the scrip was valueless on the 28th, in your judgment; you have told us Poulton did not come in to pay till the 28th, will you be so good as to tell me what value you attached to the pledge of that scrip which you describe to be valueless?—In the first place, I considered, on the 18th of January, when the limit expired, it was valuable; and in the next place, I considered it was a tolerably good security that a man would come and redeem his scrip who had signed the deed for a large sum and rendered himself liable; he could get no benefit from that signature or liability without getting the new scrip, and he could not get that without bringing the money.

20501. Would there be no benefit to the company by having the name down for that amount, though it was no benefit to him?—I do not think there would.

20502. You having stated there was a difficulty in getting persons to sign?—I have stated directly the contrary.

20503. Was there a difficulty in getting persons to sign?—There was no occasion to take steps to get persons to sign, they came in voluntarily.

20504. If it was not an object to get persons to sign, how do you account for the directors signing?—That was the 28th, I am speaking of the 18th; you jump from one thing to another.

20505. Poulton's scrip you held over to the 28th?—Yes.

20506. As you thought the scrip valueless on the 28th, what sort of value could you attach to it on the 27th?—It was brought to me when it was valuable; he could get it exchanged by paying 1 *l.*; but on the 28th of January, when the directors signed, it was ten days afterwards, and no person having brought in that old scrip, it had been forfeited; and Poulton's not having been forfeited to that amount, it was of value.

20507. Do you or not say it was an object to get subscriptions about the 28th of January?—It certainly was an object; that was one of the great reasons which the directors had for taking upon themselves this extraordinary large liability; they could not get the parties to come in; there were three or four thousand old scrip not brought in; they thought it right that part of it should be subscribed for, and they did it themselves.

20508. If it was not an object to get subscriptions, will you account for the name of Peters being allowed to stand on the deed at the time it was deposited here, when you must have known he had paid no deposit till long afterwards, and the man being a comparative stranger to you?—Mr. Peters was as much a *bonâ fide* subscriber as any man ever was in this town; and paying the deposit, in my humble opinion, has nothing to do with it; but as to my allowing it to be there, I had no power to strike any man's signature out of the deed.

20509. Had you a power to let him do it?—It was my act; he brought the old scrip and signed the deed, and asked me to wait a few days, and he would come and take up the new scrip and pay for it. I explained this on a former day.

20510. After you had communicated to the directors that a party, if not more than one party, had signed the deed without paying the deposit, did they tell you you ought not to act in that way, and that you ought not to do it in another case?—No, they did not.

20511. Were you well acquainted with William Kingdom?—Yes, I knew him.

20512. Before the 28th of January?—Yes, I have known him the last year.

20513. Had

20513. Had you been acquainted with him further than seeing him at the railway office?—That was my first acquaintance with him.

20514. Coming for some shares?—He was a friend of one of the gentlemen, and used to come and ask how we were getting on.

20515. He did not pay till a very late period; he has paid 167 *l.* very recently?—It was paid into the bankers' the 17th of March; he probably paid me the 15th.

20516. Did you ever mention to the company that Kingdom was in this position?—It is very likely I did.

20517. I find Mr. Spencer too has paid his deposit after the 2d of February?—That was the balance the 14th of March; it is entered here 70 *l.*; they were both of them large subscribers for a great deal more than that, they had paid a large sum before.

20518. Did you mention that case to the directors?—It is more than probable I did.

20519. Thomas Goodall, he paid his deposit upon 150 shares lately?—There are two 150's to Goodall.

20520. There is only one, according to your return, since the 2d of February?—He paid it the 21st of February; it was probably paid to me the 19th.

20521. Did you mention that case?—I think I had hardly an opportunity, he is a gentleman who lives at Brighton, and it was paid at Brighton; I merely state the date entered in my cash book.

20522. Can you give us any further information as to the Brighton shares; you said you had no accurate information as to the time the deposits were paid; have you any Brighton bankers' pass book?—We have no Brighton bankers' book at all, the money was paid into Messrs. Hankey's; and I stated that the business was done there in the same way as here, that the deeds were placed there during the limit, and then removed to the solicitor's, but whether they were so strict as to the limit, as we were in London, I do not know.

20523. Have you any means of ascertaining the payment of the deposits at Brighton, and the signing the deed?—You put two questions in one; I can tell you when the deposits were paid, but not when the deed was signed; if the deposit was paid into the bankers', the party might have gone and signed the deed the next week; if you will mention any name, I think I can tell.

20524. Here is a Mr. Silvester Cahill, or Mr. Joseph Browne Wilkes?—Mr. Cahill is for 20 *l.*, it was paid the 10th of December.

20525. Now Joseph Browne Wilkes, Sussex-square, Brighton, seventy-two shares, 5,400 *l.*?—He is one who paid subsequent to the 2d of February, that is down on the 22d; but though he signed at Brighton, he is one of the directors, and he paid it in London; it was paid into the bankers' about the 22d, and paid to me the 20th.

20526. Have the goodness to see whether Mr. Wilkes has not made two payments since the 2d of February?—Yes; on the 18th of March, 25 *l.*

20527. No other?—No other since the 2d.

20528. I find a Mr. Wilkes returned as having paid 325 *l.* since the 2d of February?—I am confining myself now, and I thought you were your questions, to where old scrip was exchanged; that 300 *l.* is the new scrip.

20529. Turn to it?—That was on the 4th of May.

20530. What is the entry?—£. 300.

20531. If it be so, will you tell me how it is you have not returned the other sum that Mr. Wilkes paid?—I have; have I not?

20532. If you find there 300 *l.*, you have returned only 325 *l.* paid after the 2d of February.—Is there not the 72 *l.*?

20533. No. Be so good as to give me the sum that Mr. Wilkes has paid since the 2d of February for shares subscribed for before the 2d of February?—£.72.

20534. What is the next?—I am in great doubt; this book shows when the money was paid.

20535. When was it paid?—The 22d of February.

20536. Was it paid at Brighton or here?—In London, the 18th of March, there appears 25 *l.*

20537. What is the third entry?—That is the 300 *l.*

20538. According to that, you have excluded from the return the 72 *l.*?—Will you have the goodness to read the heading of that return?

20539. "A Return of the Names of the Subscribers entered in the cash book, who entered their names as subscribers before the 2d of February 1837, but who

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

22 May 1837.

paid the deposit on their subscriptions after that date, with the deposits so paid by them respectively."—Is not Mr. Wilkes in that list for 72*l.*?

20540. No; for 325*l.*?—That is a list of persons who signed the deed subsequently to the 2d.

20541. No; it is previously, and it was paid in after the 2d of February; shall I take it that you have omitted the 72*l.*?—The 325*l.* would be in one return, and the 72*l.* in another, if it is not omitted altogether; his name will not appear three times in the same list, one being a subscription prior to the 2d of February, and two others afterwards.

20542. You say you have sometimes held money over two days; do you think it a fair way of making a return to this Committee to return a man who has paid you the 22d of February as a party who has signed subsequently?—No; that is not the case exactly.

20543. Mr. *Clarkson.*] What is the payment of the 22d?—£.72, and it ought to have been in that list.

20544. *Chairman.*] No. 11 will require another correction?—Yes; as far as I can see at present.

20545. Mr. *Rowe.*] Am I to take it in that way, that this 72*l.* ought to be added to this list?—Yes, as far as I can see at present.

20546. There is a man here called Owen, who has got fifty shares; can you tell me when Mr. Owen paid his money; did you know him before?—Yes.

20547. Further than seeing him in that place?—I know he is a clergyman in the country; I do not see his name at all; it is the 29th of April.

20548. Had you any particular reason for allowing Mr. Owen not to pay his deposit till so long a time afterwards?—No; nor had I any particular reason for pressing the payment; I knew him as a respectable man.

20549. It being the general course that parties should pay, will you give me any special reason that induced you to waive the general rule in this case?—That was my reason, knowing him to be a respectable man,

20550. Did you communicate that fact to the directors?—I think it very likely I did; but I cannot say I did.

20551. I find Spencer, for seventy shares; what induced you to relax the rule with respect to him?—Because he requested me, and because I knew him, as far as I could know from his appearance, to be a respectable man; he said he was a barrister.

20552. Did you mention his case to the directors?—I might do it; I cannot say I did.

20553. Mr. *Clarkson.*] All those persons left their scrip with you?—Yes; Mr. Spencer paid the 14th March, 70*l.*

20554. *Chairman.*] His name appears a little higher up for 255 shares?—He signed the deed, and paid at two different times.

20555. Mr. *Rowe.*] I should be glad to know, if you will point it out to me, at what time Spencer paid the deposit upon those other shares; I find William Spencer is down altogether for 22,000*l.* and odd, at different times?—January 17th, 85*l.*; he paid January 19th, 20*l.*; February 4th, it is entered here, paid me about the 2d, 130*l.*; and March 14th, 70*l.* I do not know whether that makes the 300 and odd pounds.

Chairman.] Yes, that makes 305*l.*

20556. Mr. *Rowe.*] The 130*l.* is not in this return?—No; it was paid to me on the 2d.

20556*. Now Mr. Warner, did you know him?—I did not know him; I have known him recently, from having seen him here.

20557. Did you know anything of him to induce you to relax as to him?—I do not know that I did relax.

20558. You did not know he was a minor or a clerk?—No; I did not see him.

20559. Do you mean to say you allowed those things to be done by deputy?—No.

20560. Did you allow those under you in the office to act upon those terms; did you allow them to take the signatures of parties without paying the deposit?—They had no business to take the deposit; the deed was signed in the clerk's office, and they came over to me and exchanged the scrip, endorsed the receipt, and paid the money.

20561. In Warner's case, it appears that Warner did all those necessary articles,

articles, except paying the deposit; can you account for that?—No; he did not do all that.

20562. What did he not do?—A gentleman of the name of Bacon Williams, a man very well known in the city of London, came to me on the 18th of January, when I was very busy; I had known Mr. Williams a great many years as a private friend: he said, "Here is fifty old scrip, and I will call in a day or two and do what is necessary," and afterwards bringing me a scrap of paper, showing that they were signed. I should have said, if I had been asked the question, that he had signed the deed; and it was not till I looked at the deed a few days afterwards, that I found the name of Warner, and then I ascertained that was the party whom Mr. Williams had taken into the clerk's office: "Here is a person come to sign for fifty shares;" and he signed for them, and Mr. Williams brought me the scrip.

20563. On the same day?—At the same time; but I never saw Mr. Warner.

20564. You have told us that the proper course of business was, that the party should sign the deed in the outer room, and have the scrip there counted, and have his money counted too?—No, not the money; they had nothing to do with the money.

20565. In this case it would appear that Mr. Williams brought the scrip, and did not pay the money?—Yes; he brought it in the way I have stated.

20566. Did you report it to the directors?—I do not know that I did; Mr. Williams was placed at the moment under very lamentable circumstances as to his family; and it appeared to me, now it is brought to my recollection, he was in a very agitated state, his wife was dying, and did in point of fact die the next morning; and that was the reason of his doing, knowing me, what others did not do.

20567. After having found that Mr. Warner had signed, and that Mr. Williams had not signed, and that a fraud or deception had been practised upon you, did you remonstrate?—With whom?

20568. Mr. Williams.—No.

20569. Did you ever represent to the directors that a fraud had been practised upon them, and that Mr. Williams had professed to have signed when some one else had signed for him?—No; Mr. Williams might have come with Mr. Warner, as his principal, for aught I know; I did not know whether he was a big man, or a little man, or a minor.

20570. Have you not told me in the last five minutes that Mr. Williams gave you reason to believe, or you believed that he had signed the deed?—He said they were signed for.

20571. Did you afterwards find that Mr. Williams had not signed the deed?—Yes.

20572. And that Mr. Warner had?—Yes.

20573. When you found that you had been deceived upon that point, did you remonstrate?—I did not consider I was deceived; I do not know that he said he had signed the deed: he said here are the scrip; I am in a great hurry; I will settle about them some other time, or something of that sort.

20574. Whether you were mistaken, or whether you were deceived, putting it in which way you please, did you ever represent the matter to Mr. Williams, or to the directors, when you found that Mr. Williams's name was not, and that another person's was upon the deed?—No, I do not think I did; there was no reason why I should do so in the world.

20575. Now, with regard to Mr. Huckvale, did Mr. Huckvale state to you he had an interest in those shares of Poulton's?—Upon my word I cannot tell you; it is a very difficult thing to answer questions of this sort; I did not know Mr. Huckvale.

20576. You know him now?—I have seen him since.

20577. Do you know that that party came to you with Poulton?—I have answered that already.

20578. Have you any doubt the person that came with Poulton was Mr. Huckvale?—I dare say he was.

20579. Have you any doubt that you made the arrangement that the scrip for which Poulton had signed should remain with you?—I dare say the arrangement was made; I cannot say with whom.

20580. Have you any doubt you made it with Mr. Huckvale in his presence?—I should

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

22 May 1837.

—I should entertain very great doubt about it being with Mr. Huckvale; the arrangement is the leaving the 400*l.* unpaid.

20581. Yes; have you any doubt you made the arrangement?—I have no doubt that, being requested, I permitted that arrangement to be made; they depositing with me the old scrip as usual.

20582. Do you mean to say you did it by deputy?—I permitted them to do what they wished, namely, to leave their scrip for five hundred and ten shares, and take only one hundred and ten new scrip, and leave the rest.

20583. Did you make that arrangement with them?—Yes; I permitted them to have the indulgence; I put it in that way; the arrangement was not mine, it is not a word I like to have; it was a favour asked by them, which I granted.

20584. Was it asked by them, and granted by you?—Yes.

20585. You were a party to it?—Yes.

20586. Did you not afterwards well know that Mr. Huckvale, who came and took those shares, was Mr. Huckvale, and not Mr. Poulton, when the deposit was paid?—I really cannot answer that question; I do not recollect looking at the receipt; if I had looked at it, I should have known it, because it is signed, "for B. W. Poulton, Robert Huckvale;" therefore it was Mr. Huckvale who came with the money and took the scrip.

20587. Have you any doubt that you were aware at the time that the person who brought the money was not Poulton?—I do not see how I could be aware of it, I did not ask a question.

20588. Did he not bring you an order?—He brought a little memorandum I had given to Poulton, acknowledging I held 400 old scrip for him, Poulton's; now I find that the person who brought the papers was Mr. Huckvale; any other man who brought the 400*l.* would have got the scrip.

20589. Did you look at the receipt or not?—I cannot say whether I did or not.

20590. Was it your habit, in taking a sum of 400*l.*, which would represent a much larger number of shares, and a very large amount of liability, to take it without looking at the receipt?—It was not my habit; I might have done it; I cannot say now.

Mr. *George Vernon,* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *Geo. Vernon.*

20591. Mr. *Rowe.*] DID you sign Rennie's deed for the sum of 3,000*l.*?—Yes.

20592. Did you sign more than once?—Yes.

20593. Making that sum?—Yes.

20594. Will you allow me to ask you what you are?—I am at present a clerk in the firm of Lewis & Davis, in Basinghall-street.

20595. What are they?—Cloth merchants.

20596. Were you a clerk in the employ at the time?—I was.

20597. You were not a partner at the time you signed as merchant?—I was not a merchant in that firm.

20598. Nor any other?—I had some little transactions of my own, and I may style myself a merchant.

20599. When you signed this deed to the amount of 3,000*l.*, did you sign the deed for yourself or other parties?—I signed it for other parties.

20600. Can you give me the names of those other parties?—If it is absolutely necessary, I will state them.

20601. *Chairman.*] Yes, it is?—A gentleman of the name of Lambert Dexter.

20602. Mr. *Rowe.*] Who besides?—John Ebenezer Davis.

20603. It was at their request?—Yes.

20604. *Chairman.*] How many did you sign for the one, and how many for the other?—The one for twenty-five shares, and the other fifteen; Mr. Davis for twenty-five, and the other for fifteen.

20605. Mr. *Rowe.*] Did you on both occasions go to the Poultry?—I will not be certain, but I think I signed both at the Poultry.

20606. Who gave you the scrip; did you carry the old scrip with you?—I did.

20607. Did you carry money besides?—Yes.

20608. Who gave you that money?—The two gentlemen for whom I signed.

20609. Who did you see at the office where you signed?—I am not acquainted with them.

20610. Should

20610. Should you know the persons if you were to see them?—No.

20611. Do you recollect whether any questions were asked you?—Not any questions; I went as a matter of business.

20612. No questions were asked you whether you signed for yourself?—Nothing of the kind.

20613. Were you at all acquainted with any of the parties you saw there?—Not one.

20614. Did you deliver the blue scrip to the parties that sent you, on your return?—I did.

20615. Without going into your private affairs, at the time you signed this deed, were you aware you were making yourself liable for 3,000 *l.*?—Yes, I was.

20616. And prepared to meet that liability?—I was quite satisfied with relying upon those parties.

20617. From your own resources, I mean?—If it is necessary to answer that question I will, though I should think it a very unfair one.

20618. Did you put down your name upon that deed on your own liability?—I was liable.

20619. Did you anticipate you should be called upon?—Yes, I did.

20620. You were a salaried clerk at that time?—Yes.

20621. Had you the means of meeting that sum of 3,000 *l.*?—If it is necessary for me to answer that question, I will do so immediately.

20622. *Chairman.*] Yes, I think it is?—I was not; but these parties are highly respectable; the one is my employer, and the other a gentleman for whom I am in the habit of doing business; I did it as a matter of business.

20623. To accommodate them?—As a matter of business. I am often in the habit of doing business for that gentleman for sums much larger than 3,000 *l.*, I assure you.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

20624. It is not unusual in the city for a merchant to trade to a much larger extent than his capital?—It is not.

20625. You would think it a very hard thing to limit trading to the extent of a man's capital?—I should think so.

20626. It would have a very odd effect upon trade, as well as upon railways?—I should think so.

20627. You understand me as not wishing to dive into your private history; but, in the first place, you had a perfect reliance upon the honour and integrity of the honourable persons for whom you were acting?—Yes; or I should not suppose I should have signed the deed.

20628. You do not know what odd things are supposed here; do you think that those gentlemen would have held you harmless from any consequences arising from your signing the deed?—Yes; I have no doubt that they would.

20629. Have you any doubt that they have the means of doing it?—I am quite satisfied of that.

20630. Probably you could pay the calls as they became due from time to time?—I might; I was not at that moment able to pay 3,000 *l.*, but I might have paid the calls.

20631. My learned friend knew you were not likely to be called upon in that way; but at the time you put your name to the deed were you quite aware you were making yourself liable for that sum, as it might be called for, between the time of the signing of the deed and the passing of the Act of Parliament?—I should think I was not liable till the Act passed, for the whole amount.

20632. Were you aware that you would have been liable for the expenses of the prosecution of this undertaking, proportionably with others, for the amount of these shares?—Yes.

20633. No fraud was practised upon you by anybody?—Most certainly not.

Re-examined by Mr. *Rowe.*

20634. Without impeaching the integrity of these honourable persons, are you aware of this, that the parties who induced you to sign escaped all legal liability by putting you forward?—I presume not.

20635. Do you think that those persons would be responsible legally, you having put your name to the deed?—Yes.

Mr. *Geo. Vernon.*

22 May 1837.

20636. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You do not know the distinction between a court of common law and a court of equity?—I presume the Court of Chancery would enforce the payment by them.

[The Witness withdrew.

Henry Starling, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Henry Starling.

20637. Mr. *Rowe.*] ARE you the party whose name appears on this deed of Rennie's, as "Henry Starling, 43, Great Cambridge-street, Hackney-road, forty shares"?—Yes.

20638. At the time you signed it, were you a clerk?—Yes.

20639. In whose employ?—Messrs. Orchard, solicitors, Hatton-garden.

20640. Did you sign for yourself?—No; for Mr. Thomas Orchard.

20641. Did you pay the deposit upon the shares?—Yes.

20642. Did Mr. Orchard supply you with the money?—Yes.

20643. You had no interest in the shares yourself?—No.

20644. As you are an attorney's clerk, you know something of legal liabilities; do you know that you made yourself liable by signing the deed?—He said he would take care I got into no bother; that when the money was to be paid up, he would pay it.

20645. I should not be affronting you by asking you if you could pay that money?—I could not.

20646. Mr. *C. Lushington.*] Are you of age?—Yes.

20647. Were you of age at the time you signed the deed?—Yes.

20648. Mr. *Alexander.*] What is your age now?—Twenty-two, next September.

20649. Mr. *Rowe.*] Did you go to the Poultry to sign?—Yes, Chapel-place.

20650. Who did you see there?—I saw some gentlemen.

20651. Should you know them again? Do you know the secretary, Mr. Dean?—Yes, I think I saw him; a short gentleman it was.

20652. Have you seen him here to-day?—I have not been in the room before.

20653. Was any question put to you, or any objection made to your signing?—No.

20654. No objection was made to your signing?—They asked me where I lived.

20655. Had you ever seen any of the parties before?—No.

20656. Quite strangers?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

20657. You produced the white scrip and paid the deposit, and got the blue scrip in exchange?—Yes.

20658. And acted in every way as the owner of the scrip?—Yes; so far as paying the money, and giving the white scrip, and receiving the blue.

20659. Was that all that was requisite to be done?—Yes.

20660. You had full confidence in Mr. Orchard, that he would take the responsibility upon himself?—Yes.

20661. Is he a gentleman that is able to take that responsibility upon himself?—Four or five times as much, I should think.

20662. Was Mr. Orchard out of town at the time?—I should think not.

20663. What time was it, you signed?—In the middle of the day.

20664. What time of the year was it, or what month; do you know the month it was?—No; I do not.

20665. Have you heard Mr. Orchard state since, that he was willing to take the responsibility upon himself, if it was necessary, by signing the deed?—Yes; I have heard him say it several times.

20666. Mr. *C. Lushington.*] At the time you were asked to sign this deed on account of your principal, did no doubt arise in your mind as to the propriety of the transaction?—None whatever; I thought Mr. Orchard would not ask me to do anything improper.

20667. You did not put any question upon that subject to Mr. Orchard?—No; I did not.

Re-examined by Mr. *Rowe.*

20668. When was it Mr. Orchard told you he should be happy to take the liability upon himself by signing the deed?—Two or three months ago, and he said so this morning, and several times.

[The Witness withdrew.

[Adjourned till to-morrow, at Twelve o'clock.

Martis, 23° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. Thornely.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. H. Warburton.
Mr. C. Lushington.	

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Henry Dean,* was again called in; and further Examined, as follows:

20669. Mr. *Rowe.*] CAN you now give us the number of shares subscribed for at the bankers' on the second deed?—Yes, from the 12th to the 15th of November.

[*The Witness delivered in a Return.*]

20670. Are those days both inclusive?—Yes.

20671. I see you return 2,032 as subscribed for on the London deed at Messrs. Hankey's?—Yes.

20972. One hundred and forty on the Manchester deed, and 181 on the Brighton deed?—Yes.

20673. I say nothing about the London deed, because I presume you have checked that by the bankers' book?—Yes.

20674. You told me yesterday you gave it then accurately?—The deed gives it accurately, because the gentleman at the bankers' is the man who witnessed none others but at the bankers'.

20675. Tell me how you have verified the number of shares signed at Manchester?—Because a clerk took them down, and brought them up again within the limit, I suppose. We sent down a clerk to Liverpool and Manchester, a day at each place; and when he came up, he brought up the deed, signed by 140 persons.

20676. The whole will turn upon when it was done; you have returned them as signing between the 12th and the 15th?—The clerk went down, to the best of knowledge, and came back within that period.

20677. Within what period?—Between the 12th and 15th, or before the 15th; he might have left before the 12th, but he came back, I am tolerably certain, before the 15th; but as he is not my clerk, I cannot speak to it with certainty.

20678. Had you any ground for believing it?—To the best of my recollection, I can speak to it as being the time.

20679. The Brighton deed, how do you know that?—I had that deed, and I have traced it by the payments made.

20680. With the bankers' book?—With the accounts that they sent up occasionally.

20681. And you know that they were signed within those days?—Yes, to the best of my knowledge; I have divided them according to the dates of payment.

20682. The Brighton deed is accurate, because it enables you to fix it to a day?—Yes, I think so.

20683. You have returned 2,353 as signed for at the bankers' in the country on those four days?—Yes, and in London.

20684. Being just 115 shares less than you gave us yesterday?—Because I had not gone into it so accurately.

20685. Did you not tell me with regard to those signed at the bankers' there could not be any mistake?—Yes, I thought so.

20686. There is a discrepancy between your account of yesterday, which you

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

thought to be positively accurate, and your return, of 115 shares?—Yes, because I have gone into the account more accurately.

20687. Now give any explanation you like?—I have nothing further to say about it.

20688. Now give me the next period?—

[*The Witness handed in another Return.*]

20689. This is from the 15th of November to the 11th of January?—Yes.

20690. Are those days inclusive?—It ought to be from the 16th, to the 11th of January, both inclusive.

20691. The number is 3,433, being just 1,133 shares less than you returned yesterday?—Yes, very likely.

20692. Have you any wish to explain how that happened?—No, none at all.

20693. Now take the period from the 11th to the 18th of January, both days inclusive?—

[*The Witness handed in a Return.*]

20694. This is a return of 4,283 shares on the London deed, from William Morgan to William Spencer, and the Brighton deed 590?—Yes.

20695. I see William Spencer's name occurs more than once; will you tell me which is the William Spencer you fixed upon?—The last one.

20696. You said, yesterday, that Mackay signed on the 25th?—Yes, he did, or at least the money was paid in on the 25th; I presume so, as it was in the city; I say he signed on the 25th, because it was paid in on the 25th.

20697. How do you know William Spencer to be the last person signing on the 18th?—In the first place, because from recollection I am very sure it was the case, but particularly that recollection is confirmed by his being immediately before Mackay, who I have every reason to believe was the first person that signed the deed under any especial case.

20698. Will you be so kind as to refer to the 50*l.* for the 50 shares, and tell me when it was paid in?—He was one of those who did not pay at the moment. I see on the 19th of January he paid in 20*l.*, and on the 2d February 130*l.*, and that 50*l.* was a proportion of that. He signed two or three times, and paid at two or three different times.

20699. Mr. Spencer had paid all in a lump?—No, in two or three sums.

20700. The sum of 130*l.*?—Yes.

20701. That being so, the sum that Spencer is entered for in the cash-book is no index?—No, certainly not.

20702. You did not arrive at it by the cash-book?—No, not that particular case.

20703. Be kind enough to tell me when John Ireland's money was paid?—It was paid into the bankers' the 21st of January, and paid to me on the 18th, no doubt.

20704. When was John Beetham Jackson's 20 shares paid in?—The 25th of January.

20705. When was William Olney's paid in?—On the 19th.

20706. Paid into the bankers' or to you?—Paid into the bankers'.

20707. George Webb, 10 shares?—The same as Jackson.

20708. John Harman?—That was paid in a considerable time afterwards.

20709. And James Swabey is in the same situation?—Yes.

20710. Go to Henry Newark, five shares?—That is on the 19th.

20711. *Chairman.*] Paid into the bankers'?—Yes.

20712. Mr. *Rowe.*] John Edwards, 20 shares?—The same.

20713. William Smith, five shares?—The 19th.

20714. William Kingdom, 35 shares?—He signed it two or three different times, and paid in a large lump; he paid his the 17th of March.

20715. You have no clue to him?—No; he is on the list.

20716. Thomas Godwin?—This is the 19th; all these are the 19th.

20717. Robert Sutton, jun. 200?—He paid afterwards; he had paid 100*l.* the 2d of February.

20718. Henry Frederick Warner?—That was one of the after-payers; it was not necessary to put a date to each name after a certain time.

20719. You

20719. You have stated already, I believe, that the money was generally paid in by you at the bankers' a day or two after it was received?—Yes.

20720. That being so, four of those names I find, Godwin's, Olney's, Newark's and Edwards's, are all dated the 19th?—Yes, paid in.

20721. If the money paid in by Jackson, William Smith and Robert Sutton, which are dated respectively the 25th—— ?—Smith is the 19th.

20722. Here is Jackson, the 25th; Webb, the 25th; and here is Ireland, the 21st; as you made the payment to the bankers on the 19th, of the money received by you on the 18th, will you account to me for not having paid in the money received from Jackson, Webb and Robert Sutton at the same time, if you received this money on the 18th?—Robert Sutton, I did not.

20723. If Jackson and Webb really paid on the 18th, and you really made a payment on the 19th, will you account for having retained the money of those two parties only?—I can account for it in this way, that the three who appear on the 21st paid it to me after banking hours.

20724. There is only one on the 21st?—Jackson and Webb, it is; I do not know which you mean.

20725. If they really paid you on the 18th, and you paid over the money on the 19th received on the 18th, will you account to me for holding that money and not paying it in, if they paid you?—I have no particular recollection of the circumstance.

20726. Have you any knowledge of it?—I was very much in the habit, and probably this was one case where persons paid cheques, of being particular in sending them in as soon as I could; but sometimes they came after banking hours; if they came in notes, I did not always send them till they amounted to a certain sum; but I see the object of the question; and as far as the line I have drawn is concerned, with respect to the number of parties who signed and paid up to the 18th of January, I have drawn the line at Mackay, because he was, I am very sure, the first person who signed as a special case; he signed after the 18th of January; as to the other part of your question, asking me to account for not having paid it on a particular day, I cannot state any particular reason, except that I chose not to do it.

20727. May you not have been under a mistake in this; is it not a remarkable thing that you should have paid in money on the 19th received on the 18th, and should retain this?—I have stated the ground on which I have drawn the line at Mackay, and having gone through it, I can abide by it.

20728. Do not these payments directly conflict with the line you have drawn?—Certainly not.

20729. Will you be kind enough to refer to your book and ascertain the way in which Jackson did pay?—I cannot tell.

20730. Have you the bankers' book?—Yes; but it does not show.

20731. You cannot tell whether it was paid in a cheque?—No.

20732. Whilst I am upon this point, about the entry of these dates, reminding you, you have said you generally paid in those sums in the course of a couple of days, allow me to refer you again to the payment of 400 *l.* by Huckvale; you have stated that that 400 *l.* was paid to you on the 28th?—Yes.

20733. Your cash-book says that that sum was paid in by you the 13th of February?—Yes.

20734. Will you account for the long lapse of time between the receipt on the 28th of January and the paying it into the bankers'?—Merely my holding it myself.

20735. You cannot explain it in any other way?—No.

An extract from the evidence of the Witness, beginning at the question No. 16761, and ending at question 16767, was read.

20736. I have given you six instances running in which you have stated having received monies; you paid them in generally on the same day or the next day, or, at the outside, the second day. I now come to the case of Poulton; B. W. Poulton, 400 *l.*; entered the 13th of February, paid the 28th of January, as I showed you yesterday by the receipt; then there are the other instances, of William Spencer, Goodall, Hill, Bridges, Swabey and Heaviside; all those names you speak to as having received the monies and paid them in in the course of one or two days at the outside; in all those instances you have said that the money was paid in in the course of two or three days, and the only exception in

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

those 10 or 12 names is the case of Poulton; in Poulton's case it appears you held the money from the 28th of January to the 13th of February; and you having made repeated payments to the bankers in the meantime, how do you account for holding it?—I do not account for it at all, except that I did it, and had a clear right to do it, if I pleased.

20737. That one sum alone?—Yes, that one sum.

20738. Does not that lead you to suspect the accuracy of your memory as to the date of the receipt, when you find you received 10 or 12 other sums, and paid them in in a couple of days, and that this payment was made in the intermediate time, which is a remarkable payment, of 400*l.*; does not that lead you to conceive you may be inaccurate as to the day on which you received it?—No, I do not think so at all.

20739. Did Mr. Huckvale pay you by cheque?—By notes.

20740. You mean to adhere to that; you do not doubt the accuracy of your recollection, with all those facts staring you in the face?—No, I have no reason to doubt it, or suspect that the date of the receipt is different from what I have stated.

20741. Were the company at that time so very flush in their circumstances that 400*l.* was no object?—They had plenty of money; they had always a good balance at their bankers'; I took care of that.

20742. You have returned, in the Return No. 7, yesterday, 216 depositors up to the 2d of February inclusive?—That was also altered; there is a fresh return here. I have gone through all these things with the very greatest care I could, but it is a very difficult thing to make them out; we have been up almost all night about them.

20743. The return I have got here is a summary of the number of depositors, and the amount deposited?—Exactly.

20744. If you have a more accurate return, I will act upon it; yesterday, according to this return, it was stated that the number of depositors was 216?—Yes, up to the 2d of February.

20745. Do you mean to correct that to-day, or am I to take that as the real number?—The number of depositors as put there would be reduced by so many names as have signed more than once; there would not be in fact 216 individual depositors up to the 2d of February, but there appears to have been 216 deposits at different times.

20746. Can you tell me how many depositors there were?—I have not those given in last, but I have gone through the whole up to the present time.

20747. The 2d of February is a very material point, although this may be an inaccurate return, namely 216, because some have deposited twice; still the amount deposited will be correct?—Yes, 10,300*l.*

20748. You have returned, in your financial statement, that on the 2d of February you had received only 10,300*l.* in deposits?—Yes.

20749. You will find, that between the name of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, on the printed list, and the end, the number of shares subscribed for is 4,076, which would give a deposit 4,076*l.*, would not it?—I do not understand the question.

20750. The number of shares from Poulton's name to the end is 4,076?—Yes.

20751. *Chairman.*] Supposing that was a correct statement of what is the number of shares in the subscriptions, between Benjamin Wheeler Poulton and the end of the list, it is obvious that the result would be 4,076*l.* paid as deposits?—Yes; but it does not follow from this list that 4,076 was subscribed after Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, because here the whole of the Brighton subscription follow; they were subscribed for long before, and the Manchester and Wigan shares they are stuck in following Poulton's, I do not know why.

20752. Mr. *Rowe.*] Can you tell me what I am to deduct from this?—If you had gone to the end of this, you would have seen the whole sum divided.

20753. *Chairman.*] You have to take out of it the Brighton and country subscriptions?—Yes; there are 791 for Brighton, and 140 for Manchester and other places.

20754. Mr. *Rowe.*] If I deduct that, it would give the number of shares subscribed for after Poulton's name?—Yes, if that printed copy is a true copy of the deed.

20755. *Chairman.*] That leaves 3,145.

20756. Mr. *Rowe.*] If you deduct that from 10,300 *l.*, the amount of deposits paid, it will give 7,155 ?—Yes.

20757. Now, we have arrived at this on the 2d of February, or rather the 18th of January, the time that Poulton's money was signed for; the total amount of deposit paid was 7,155 *l.*; and you have stated that the new company, on starting, was 8,000 *l.* in debt?—With which they had nothing to do; and I must beg first to request that words may not be put into my mouth which I never said; what I stated, I think in answer to a question from Mr. Austin, was, that the expenses or disbursements of the company last year were 8,000 *l.* more than the deposits received. I do not recollect that he put the question further to me; but if he had asked me how it was settled, I should have stated that before any of the deposits or the new account were received, a settlement was made between the directors and the professional gentlemen, who voluntarily came forward and gave the directors a receipt, taking the balance of what remained of the old account in discharge of their claims; it was the very large professional claims that made the demands more than 32,000 *l.*; they took what remained, and gave a receipt in full, and no farthing of the subscription of the new company has ever been devoted to paying a farthing of the debt of the old.

20758. Has the old debt been paid off?—Yes, entirely.

20759. *Chairman.*] A receipt has been given in full?—Yes.

20760. By the professional gentlemen?—Yes, all of them; the solicitors and engineers.

20761. They divided it amongst them?—Yes.

20762. All the professional gentlemen, not merely the solicitors?—Yes.

20763. A deduction *pro ratâ*?—Yes, they distributed a sort of dividend amongst themselves; it was paid over to them, and they managed it amongst themselves.

20764. Not the counsel?—No; they get their money in full, I believe, to the best of my knowledge.

20765. Mr. *Rowe.*] Was I wrong in supposing that the proceeds of the old company were at that time exhausted; you say there was something in hand, and that was divided?—Yes, there was; there was a balance of money at the bankers', and when it was found, when the professional gentlemen's bills came in, that the whole of the liabilities exceeded the amount of the deposits previous to this new subscription taking place, an arrangement was made between the directors and the professional gentlemen, who agreed under the circumstances to take what remained and divide it among themselves, and give a receipt in full.

20766. Did some *bonâ fide* consideration pass for those receipts?—Yes.

20767. I am now reading to you your own answer, which is this: "Will it appear from your cash-book that the company was 8,000 *l.* in debt when the new deed was signed? I do not think it will."—"In what book will it appear? In the balance-sheet drawn out."—"Will it appear in the ledger? Certainly it will." You having stated that it will appear in the ledger that the company was 8,000 *l.* in debt at the time the new company was formed?—Immediately before.

20768. It appearing upon your own statement, at the time the new deed was signed the company was 8,000 *l.* in debt, do you mean to tell the Committee that any consideration passed for those receipts in full?—My answer is a repetition of what I have stated, that they did receive the whole of the balance, and the balance-sheet will show that they received the whole, or it was put under their control, and they gave a receipt; and I dare say it could be shown how much it was in the pound.

20769. *Chairman.*] Was it agreed they should have any shares in the new company?—No, nothing whatever; there was no prospect of anything else, present or remote. It was a voluntary sacrifice on their parts.

20770. Mr. *Rowe.*] Will you give me the number of shares subscribed in the period between the 18th of January and the 2d of February?—[*The Witness handed in a Return.*] That is from the 19th of January to the 2d of February, both days inclusive.

20771. London deed, from William Spencer to James ————, 2,290; Manchester deed, 250; is that subject to the correction you have stated?—Yes; it was an error, in signing the wrong deed.

20772. It is not put on the London deed?—No.

20773. That will be 2,560 altogether?—Whatever it is there.

20774. Now,

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

20774. Now, if you please, the sums paid in after the 2d of February; there were some who subscribed before the 2d of February, and who paid the deposits afterwards?—That was handed in yesterday, but it was ordered to be amended.

20775. Now we want the dates of those payments; I observe two sums paid in the 24th of April, Mr. Sutton?—Yes, that is as it appears in the books, subject to the explanation I have given all along with respect to Mr. Sutton's 500 *l.* I have inquired of him since, and he states his own conviction of the matter, that he paid me that on the Friday, which would be the 21st of April. I have asked him about it.

20776. *Chairman.*] What is the sum?—£. 500.

20777. Mr. *Rowe.*] At the time those sums were paid you by two of the directors, one by Mr. Sutton and the other by Mr. Harman, was not the fact, that a petition was about to be presented on the Monday against Rennie's line on this subject, known to the directors and to you?—Not known to me, certainly.

20778. Do you not know that a communication was made to Captain Alsager by Lord George Lennox, that such a petition would be presented on the Monday?—The Monday was the 24th.

20779. Do you not know that a communication was made on the Friday before to the directors, that on the Monday a petition would be presented?—I do not know it, nor do I believe it was the case.

20780. Will you explain those two large payments of the directors on that particular day?—There was no reason they should pay on that particular day; but there was a general reason, and that was, that the directors were in expectation that I should be very shortly called before the Committee on the Bill to prove the first resolution, which related to the deposits, and they knew it was essential that the deposits should be paid up before that. I know the object they and all of us had in view; and with respect to that, I will read a letter that I perceive I wrote on this very subject on the 4th of April to a director, which caused him to pay. No director was bound to pay upon a particular day, nor could I order them; this is in confirmation, if I may be allowed so to say, of what I am stating as my opinion of the reason of the directors paying when they did; this is dated the 4th of April 1837, directed to R. Heaviside, Esq., from myself: "Sir,—As the period is rapidly approaching when I shall be called upon to prove before the Committee of the House of Commons the payment of the deposits upon the shares in this undertaking, I have to request that you will be so good as to pay at your earliest convenience, either here or at Brighton, the deposit upon 70 shares held by you. I have the honour to be, &c., H. Dean, secretary."

20781. *Chairman.*] Was a similar letter addressed to all the directors who had not paid up?—No, he was the only one out of town; but I am satisfied a verbal communication was made by me to the other directors, in conversation, reminding them that it was necessary they should pay up, as the period was approaching when I should be called before the Committee.

20782. Mr. *Rowe.*] Did you anticipate, on the 4th of April, or when these two heavy payments were made, the petition presented on the 24th?—I do not think it has any connexion with the petition; I do not know what knowledge the directors had.

20783. Do you not know that the subject of the petition was the subject of discussion with the directors?—On Monday the 24th it was discussed, and I was present and signed a petition against it, denying the allegations.

20784. When was that presented?—On the Monday.

20785. I wish to know, did you never hear the subject of that petition mentioned two or three days before, as a coming evil?—To the best of my knowledge, I did not.

20786. How was it brought to your knowledge on the Monday?—By the solicitor mentioning that there was that petition, and on discussing the propriety of preparing a petition denying the allegations; but it was very late, and they might have paid the money on the Monday without hearing of that petition.

20787. We

20787. We will now go on to the depositors?—This return is made up to yesterday.

[*The Witness delivered in the Return.*]

20788. "A summary of the number of persons whose names appear as subscribers to the Parliamentary contract, and the amount subscribed"?—Yes.

20789. The number of signatures to the Parliamentary contract, the 22d of May, is 259, by 220 individual subscribers; the number of depositors the 22d of May, 221, one depositor having paid and not subscribed the deed; the amount subscribed is 1,111,275*l.*?—Yes.

20790. Tell me how you have made this more accurate than yesterday; yesterday it appeared there were 22 parties who had never paid any deposit at all up to that time?—The 274 was the result of my very hurriedly casting up the deed; that is the result of some clerks who have been up all night upon these returns.

20791. And you have reason to believe that this is an accurate return?—Yes, I believe so, to a figure.

20792. You have here distinguished between the individual subscribers who have signed the number of times that their signatures appear here?—Yes.

20793. Has the same rule been followed in giving the number of depositors?—Yes, the rule has been followed, because it follows as of course that the number of parties actually on the deed, as the deposits are paid, must agree with the number of depositors.

20794. Is that so; that is the very point?—Yes, it is.

20795. How have you got at that result?—By comparing the cash-book and the deed.

20796. Does it appear on that comparison that all the shares subscribed for have had the deposits paid upon them?—Yes.

20797. Were you present at meetings when some of the parties who petitioned in favour of your Bill were at your office; did you see a person of the name of Blackmore?—Which petition are you alluding to?

20798. Before this Committee.—I do not know anything of him.

20799. You are aware there have been petitions presented to the House, and referred to the Committee?—I am aware some have been printed.

20800. Praying that no notice may be taken of the other petitions, and that the line may be carried into effect; I do not know whether you call that in favour; but do you know a man of the name of Blackmore?—I do not.

20801. You did tell me, yesterday, with the exception of the directors, all parties who had signed the deed had actually deposited the white scrip?—Yes.

20802. At the time of the subscription?—No, I could not have said that; if I did, I must have been very much mistaken indeed, because it was yesterday you stated yourself, and got me to state also, that with respect to a man of the name of Soares, he has never exchanged his scrip; your question was, whether, with the exception of the directors, all other persons who had signed the deed had delivered the white scrip; my answer is, they did not, because there are two cases, Jackson and Soares, who signed at the bankers', and who therefore took the bankers' receipt, and have not yet been to me to exchange the old scrip for the new, and consequently have not got it; but the money has been paid.

20803. With those two exceptions?—Yes, with those two exceptions; that is so, to the best of my knowledge, as far as my recollection serves me.

20804. Are you aware of the transaction that took place with Mr. Rennie's clerks?—Yes, I am, certainly.

20805. Do you believe that they delivered to you the white scrip?—I think, in that case, to the best of my recollection, the white scrip was already in my possesion, given to me and paid for, no doubt of it; I am aware of the circumstance to which you allude, as to the signing; and if they did not bring it, and I cannot charge my memory with that, I had it previously in my possession.

20806. With regard to those people who have subscribed since the 2d of February, have all those parties deposited white scrip; we have got it in evidence that the directors did not?—No, they did not; their signatures were not for white scrip.

20807. Have the parties who have subscribed since?—Yes; I should think so.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

20808. Do you know?—Yes.

20809. Robert Sutton, he has signed since; did he give you white scrip?—He had given it me a considerable time before, with other white scrip; he found he had got 15 old scrip certificates more than he thought he had, till he went to his banker's box to look, and he signed for them afterwards.

20810. Do you recollect the case of Edward Northcote?—I do not recollect it, except that my attention has been drawn to it lately, in the last day or two.

20811. Should you think it impossible that you allowed him to sign in his own name, when he told you he was signing for another party?—I should say it did not take place.

20812. Or are you mistaken, when two persons speak to two similar transactions?—I have no recollection whatever of the transaction, and except that my attention has been drawn to it, I had no knowledge of it.

20813 You do not remember his coming?—You may put it down in that way.

20814. Do you recollect that the man Northcote did not pay his deposit till three weeks afterwards, and that in Bridge-street?—If that is the case, I presume he got that sort of indulgence which I had granted to a few other parties; but I do not recollect the circumstance at all; I never remember him coming.

20815. You could not tell me the price of shares at any particular day?—No, it is a thing I may have heard mentioned, but I never gave my attention to it.

20816. I want to ask you about the first meeting, which was the origin of this new company; did you happen to be there?—Certainly I was, and read the report.

20817. Can you recollect who attended it, whether it was a very large meeting?—It was a large meeting.

20818. Where was it held?—At the London Tavern.

20819. Can you tell me about how many were present, and what directors were present?—I should think that the meeting consisted of from 130 to 150 persons; I am not aware that any director was absent, though there might have been, but I think they were all there; it was considered a very large meeting, considering the time of year.

20820. That was the first company?—No, the first meeting of the second company.

20821. The meeting at which the new company originated?—It was the 18th of October, and my answer applies to that.

20822. At that time there were no new directors elected?—No.

20823. They must have been the old directors?—Yes.

20824. The first meeting was the 18th of October?—Yes.

20825. And then, no new company having been formed, and no new deed signed, no new directors were in existence?—Have you got the directors at the first starting of the second company?

20826. Who were present at that meeting?—The first set of directors of course.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

20827. You were the secretary of this Direct London and Brighton Railway from its origin?—I was.

20828. I think you have already stated, but lest you should not have done it. I will refer to it; the capital originally fixed was 800,000 *l.* upon 16,000 shares at 50 *l.* each, and a deposit of 2 *l.* a share?—It was.

20829. I suppose the first step you took was to form a provisional committee?—That was done.

20830. Was that provisional committee formed of persons of respectability and influence?—Yes.

20831. You have also given in the names of the original directors?—Yes.

20832. And I think, though I am not sure, you have given the periods at which they were elected directors?—I think I have read that.

20833. Am I right in supposing that the present direction of the present company is, at Brighton Captain Heaviside, Mr. Davis, Mr. Wilks and Mr. Robinson; at Croydon, Mr. Harman and Mr. Crowley; in London, Mr. Robert Sutton the younger, and Mr. Swabey?—Yes.

20834. Were

20834. Were the number of applicants for shares 1,315?—The number of applicants for shares was 1,281.

20835. The number of shares applied for was 45,313?—44,802.

20836. Are those corrections of the original numbers?—This is a corrected copy, made out by order of the Chairman.

20837. What was the number of shares allotted the 10th of February last year?—12,365.

20838. What proportion of those were allotted to the directors, and what proportion to subscribers generally?—10,969 to subscribers, and 1,396 to the directors.

20839. Were there after that time any additional number of shares allotted to the directors?—Subsequently they had 2,912 in addition to the 1,396.

20840. Would that leave shares remaining unappropriated 723?—Yes.

20841. Were those 723 allotted to the subscribers afterwards?—Yes.

20842. Making in the whole 4,308 to the directors?—Yes.

20843. Of those directors, did Mr. Wilks have 700 shares?—Yes, Joseph Brown Wilks; Jonathan Thorpe, 650.

20844. Robert Sutton the younger?—Six hundred and thirty-six.

20845. Matthias Wilks?—Six hundred.

20846. Charles Sedgfield Crowley?—Six hundred.

20847. John Harman?—Five hundred.

20848. Benjamin Davis?—Two hundred.

20849. Captain Richard Heaviside?—One hundred and sixty-two.

20850. Sir William Jolliffe?—One hundred and twenty.

20851. Thomas S. Robinson?—One hundred and twenty.

20852. And Colonel Hilton Jolliffe?—Twenty.

20853. Making 4,308?—Yes.

20854. Be so good as to hand in to the Committee the form of the request prepared for applicants for shares?—It is at the bottom of No. 3.

20855. Previous to the allotment of shares to anybody, was a list procured at the instance of the directors, known in the City as the black list?—There was.

20856. What was the object of obtaining that list?—The object of obtaining it was to assist them in selecting the most respectable names out of a vast number of applicants, to whom they should allot shares; they considered that that list, as I understood it, contained the names of persons not respectable, and that any person who was an applicant on that list should not have any shares allotted to him.

20857. Did any one who was on that list have any shares allotted to him?—I think not.

20858. Did the directors themselves assist in apportioning the shares to the persons to whom they should be allotted?—They did it altogether, with the assistance of their solicitor.

20859. Do you believe that those who were selected for shares to be allotted were the most respectable of those who made applications for shares?—Yes, I do.

20860. Of the 16,000 shares that were allotted, had the deposits been paid and the deed signed for 15,985 shares when this Committee first sat, leaving 15 then unallotted?—You say when this Committee first sat?

20861. Yes.—The 15,985 paid; the whole 16,000 were allotted, but owing to some mistake in the address those parties never came.

20862. All but 15 were allotted and the deposits paid?—Yes.

20863. Have you, as well the directors, gone through the list so as to be able to tell this Committee whether that list is a list composed of substantial and unobjectionable persons?—I have gone through it, and I assisted to draw out the allotment list, and so far as I have any opportunity of judging from all I have heard with reference to this list, of which so much has been said, I believe that every man who signed this deed was a man amply capable of paying the amount fixed against his name, and in every way responsible; I have no reason to doubt the fact.

20864. Was the course of inquiry made and the caution used the subject-matter of complaint by persons to whom shares were refused to be allotted?—I had a great number of grumbling people who came to know the reason they had no shares; of course I did not give them the reason.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

20865. Was the consequence of that complaint made a letter, written by you from the directors, or published on the 15th February 1836; was a letter written in consequence of the complaints made?—Yes, it was thought right and proper that some mode should be taken of expressing their regret that shares had not been allotted to all.

20866. Have the goodness to read the letter?—"The Direct London and Brighton Railway.—The directors beg leave to give notice that letters have been sent to all persons to whom shares in the above undertaking have been allotted; they have found it impossible, from the great number of applications, to return letters of regret to the many very respectable individuals whom they have been compelled to leave out of the allotment; certificates in exchange for the bankers' receipts will be ready after Wednesday next. By order of the directors, signed H. Dean, secretary; 3, Chapel-place, Poultry, February 15, 1836."

20867. Tell the Committee within about what time all the parties to whom shares were allotted came in and signed the deed; was it within two or three days?—In a very few days; I must qualify that, 12,000 and odd were certainly signed for in a very few days, perhaps three or four days; but the 783, which was the remaining number afterwards allotted, does not come within the description of three or four days.

20868. What was the amount of the deposit received?—It was 2*l.* a share, 31,970*l.*

20869. Did the directors afterwards increase the capital from 800,000*l.* to 900,000*l.*?—Yes, in consequence of some communication with the engineers.

20870. The estimates exceeded what was expected?—I do not know the reason; it was communicated to me, and I entered it on the minutes.

20871. Were there any shares issued for that additional capital?—No.

20872. You did not succeed in getting that Bill?—No.

20873. We have heard that the expenditure exceeded the deposits, and that an arrangement was made with the professional gentlemen to accept the balance in hand in discharge of their claims?—Yes.

20874. Between the period of the last Session, and your coming to Parliament this Session, were endeavours made to improve the line?—Yes, there were.

20875. Have you an advertisement that was published the 8th of October in the last year?—Yes.

20876. Be so good as to read it?—"Direct London and Brighton Railway. The directors having received the subjoined reports of the engineers, Sir John Rennie, J. U. Rastrick and Joseph Locke, Esqrs., as to the important improvements made on the direct line, and the superiority of that line over all its competitors, a general meeting of subscribers to this undertaking will be held at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate-street, London, on the 18th day of October instant, at two o'clock precisely, to receive the report of the directors and the reports of the engineers, and to consider and determine upon the measures most advisable to be adopted. (Signed) H. Dean, secretary. 3, Chapel-place, Poultry, 8th October 1836."

20877. Have you a copy of the report of Sir John Rennie and Mr. Rastrick, upon which that was founded?—Yes.

20878. Was a meeting accordingly held the 18th of October?—Yes, it was.

20879. At that meeting was this report [*handing a paper to the Witness*] read to the assembled persons?—It was.

20880. First giving a statement of the reports of the directors themselves then the report of Sir John Rennie and Mr. Rastrick?—Yes, and Mr. Locke.

20881. Did it conclude with a statement, that an account of the receipts and expenditure of the company would be laid before the meeting?—It did.

20882. In accordance with that report, was such an account of the receipts and expenditure of the company laid before the meeting?—Yes, it was laid upon the table by me.

20883. To which all persons had access?—Yes, if they pleased; and a great many did.

[*The Witness delivered in the following paper:*]

"*The*

"*The Direct London and Brighton Railway.*

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

"A numerous meeting of the subscribers of this undertaking, convened by public advertisement, was held at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate street, on Tuesday the 18th of October 1836, when the following report of the directors, containing the reports of the engineers, was read:

"Report of the Directors.

"The directors of the Direct London and Brighton Railway Company have the honour to meet the subscribers, for the purpose of laying before them a statement of their proceedings from the formation of the company, during a contest of unexampled length and severity, which ended in the defeat of the Bill for Mr. Stephenson's Line of Railway; and although the directors cannot but regret that their exertions have not been crowned with all the success they could wish, yet it is highly gratifying to them to have succeeded in preventing any other line from being sanctioned by the Legislature, thereby affording another opportunity of bringing the Direct Line before Parliament, with the important improvements which subsequent investigation has pointed out.

"It was not until the 4th of last February that the formation of the company was completed. The late period at which this undertaking appeared before the public gave the promoters of Mr. Stephenson's Line a decided advantage with reference to their proceedings in point of time, and induced many experienced persons to consider that it would be utterly impossible for the directors to comply with the Parliamentary Standing Orders; and the directors hesitate not to say that it required the most diligent and strenuous efforts of all persons connected with the undertaking to overcome the difficulties which presented themselves, and to prevent the cause of the Direct Line from being strangled in its infancy.

"The first necessary step of the directors was to apply to the landed proprietors (many of whom resided at various parts of the United Kingdom) for their assent to the line passing through their property, a task rendered extremely difficult as well as expensive, from the very short time in which it was to be accomplished, the Standing Orders requiring that all the owners, lessees and occupiers upon the line should be seen personally, and their answers obtained, and deposited with a plan and section of the line at the Private Bill Office, before the petition was presented to the House of Commons, the last day for presenting which was the 19th of February. All this was, however, done; and when it is remembered that it was in addition to the usual and necessary labour consequent upon the formation of a new company, the directors assure themselves that the subscribers will see and acknowledge that exertions of no ordinary description were used.

"On the 25th of February, after the most determined and unusual opposition on the part of the promoters of Mr. Stephenson's Line, the Standing Orders were reported to the House of Commons to have been complied with, and a Bill ordered to be brought in, which was read a second time on the 7th of March, and referred to a Committee. To this Committee the Bill for Mr. Stephenson's Line had previously been referred; and subsequently Mr. Gibbs' and Mr. Cundy's competing Lines were also referred to it.

"On the 9th of March the Committee met, and continued its sittings (with occasional adjournments) till the 15th of June. During this period the Committee sat 52 days, and examined 159 witnesses, many of whom were gentlemen of the highest scientific attainments. On the 14th of June the Committee decided that the preamble of the Bill for Mr. Stephenson's Line was proved, and that the preamble of the Bill for the Direct Line was not proved; and on the 17th of the same month the report of the Committee in favour of Mr. Stephenson's Line was brought up to the House of Commons. The Committee came to their decision, notwithstanding the inhabitants of Brighton, at several town meetings specially called for the purpose, had expressed their disapprobation of Mr. Stephenson's Line, and had presented a petition to the House of Commons in favour of the Direct Line, and against Mr. Stephenson's, signed by upwards of 4,200 persons. On the 28th of June, after a lengthened discussion in the House, the report was taken into consideration; and on the following day the Bill for Mr. Stephenson's Line was read a third time, and passed. Thus circumstanced, and notwithstanding the decision of the Committee of the House of Commons, and feeling satisfied of the superiority of the Direct Line over all

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

its rivals, and that the weight of evidence adduced before that Committee was in its favour, and having for their object the attainment of the best line of railway for the public and the town of Brighton, and being supported by the inhabitants of that place, who again expressed their opinion at a public meeting, and presented a petition to the House of Lords, signed by more than 5,500 persons, stating their objection to Mr. Stephenson's Line, and their willingness to wait another Session for the Direct Line, the directors determined to oppose Mr. Stephenson's Bill. Accordingly the directors appeared in support of the Direct Line, as a competing line, before the Committee of the House of Lords. On the 6th of July the Lords' Committee commenced its sittings, and continued (with short adjournments) till the 2d of August. During this period the Committee sat 21 days, and examined 115 witnesses. On the 2d of August the Committee decided that it was inexpedient to proceed further with the Bill for Mr. Stephenson's Line that Session: this resolution was carried by a majority of seventeen to eight. Such was the issue of a contest, which was carried on for a period and prosecuted with a vigour unprecedented in the annals of Parliament; and the directors confidently submit that the result has fully justified them in the course they adopted. It is also satisfactory to the directors to state, that after the most searching investigation, the practicability and desirableness of the Direct Line to Brighton were incontrovertibly proved before the Committees of both Houses of Parliament. Under these circumstances the directors, having still for their sole object the attainment of the best possible line of railway to Brighton, have since the close of the last Session of Parliament appointed John Urpeth Rastrick, Esq., engineer, in addition to Sir John Rennie, the original projector of the Direct Line; and those gentlemen have caused surveys of the country to be taken in every direction, and the result has been that the Direct Line has received most important improvements, as appears from their report, confirmed by that of Joseph Locke, Esq., of which the following are copies:—

"To the Directors of the Direct London and Brighton Railway.

"Gentlemen,—In pursuance of your directions, we have examined and explored the country between London and Brighton, with a view to determine upon the best line for a railway between those two places. We have caused sections to be carefully taken in every direction which we considered at all calculated to assist us in that object; and, after the most mature deliberation, we are decidedly of opinion that the Direct Line, passing through the Merstham and Clayton summits, affords not only the best line between London and Brighton, but also the most eligible line for branches to Dover, Lewes and Newhaven, and the eastern parts of Sussex, on the one side, and Reigate, Dorking, Horsham and Shoreham, and the western parts of Sussex, on the other side. We have been enabled to make most important improvements in the line, by which the heaviest works have been considerably reduced. The tunnels upon the former line were four in number, and of the total length of 3 ½ miles, the longest being 1 ¼ mile in length. We have now only two tunnels upon the whole line; one at Balcombe, about 600 yards in length, and the other at Clayton, about 800 yards in length. All this has been accomplished without altering the gradients, and the line has been carried to Church-street, Brighton, making three quarters of a mile further into the town, without increasing its total length more than about half a mile. We have explored a line passing from Merstham to the line of the South Eastern Railway, which we do not hesitate to pronounce will afford a line to Dover so superior to any that can be made by passing through either the Oxtead or Godstone summits, that we are decidedly of opinion it will be the interest of the South Eastern Railway Company to adopt this Line, and branch off from the Merstham summit, in preference to executing their main line through the Oxtead or Godstone summits. Upon the whole, taking all the circumstances into consideration, we are decidedly of opinion that no other line can be found between London and Brighton, which will afford so good a line to Brighton, or combine so many advantageous capabilities as the Direct Line; and we recommend its adoption, under the confident expectation that it is so superior to all its competitors as to render its success almost a matter of certainty. We are, gentlemen, your most humble servants,

(signed) "*John Rennie.*
"*John U. Rastrick.*"

"London, 3 October 1836."

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

"To the Directors of the Direct London and Brighton Railway.

"Gentlemen,—I have examined the improved section of the Direct London and Brighton Railway, as laid down by Sir John Rennie and Mr. Rastrick. I feel confident that the general direction of the line passing through the Merstham gap affords the best means of making the most direct line to Brighton. The magnitude of the works has been considerably reduced, without altering the gradients, and without materially lengthening the line. The tunnels also have been much shortened, and may be considered unobjectionable. Upon the whole, I believe that the alterations are substantial improvements; and from the various sections which have been exhibited to me, I consider it the best line which has been brought under my notice.

"*Joseph Locke.*"

"Birmingham, 3d October, 1836.

"With these reports before them, and considering the evidence given before the Committees of both Houses of Parliament, of the great preponderance of traffic in favour of the Direct Line, and knowing also that this company will be enabled to give the most incontestable proof, in another Session, of its great superiority over all its competitors, and more especially as the strongest points urged against it in the last Session, viz., the extent of the tunnels and the magnitude of its works, have been removed, and knowing that the feeling of the town of Brighton is almost unanimous in favour of the Direct Line, the directors strongly recommend to the subscribers that a renewed application be made to Parliament for the Direct Line of Railway to Brighton, with branches to Shoreham, Lewes, Newhaven and Reigate. To effect these objects, it will be necessary to raise the capital of the company to 1,200,000 *l.*, which the directors recommend to be done by converting every 50 *l.* into a 75 *l.* share, and calling for a further deposit of 2 *l.* per share, thereby securing the advantages of the undertaking to the original subscribers. The directors beg to inform the subscribers, that in carrying into execution the proposed improvements on their Line, so far from the original estimate being exceeded, a very considerable aggregate saving is made, by great reductions in some of the most extensive works; and it is only with a view to the accomplishment of the very important branches above alluded to that they strongly recommend to the subscribers the raising of the additional capital.

"The directors having thus put the subscribers in possession of all that has been done during the late arduous contest up to the present time, and having laid before them their views of the future course to be pursued, beg to return their thanks for the confidence which has been placed in them, and trust that the next time they meet the subscribers they shall be enabled to report that an Act has been obtained for making the Direct Line of Railway from London to Brighton. An account of the receipts and expenditure of the company will be laid before the meeting."

20884. Was the consequence of that meeting a series of resolutions by the assembled persons?—Yes.

20885. Be so good as to read those resolutions?—The report of the directors, with the report of the engineers, was read; immediately after which the following resolutions were unanimously passed:

"1. That the report of the directors now read to the meeting be received and adopted.

"2. That the directors do renew the application to Parliament in the ensuing Session, for obtaining an Act for a Direct Line of Railway to Brighton, with branches to Shoreham, Lewes, Newhaven and Reigate, and take all such means in relation thereto as they shall think proper.

"3. That the capital of the company be increased to 1,200,000 *l.*, by converting every 50 *l.* share into a 75 *l.* share, and that a call of 2 *l.* be and the same is hereby made upon each share, to be paid at such time or times as the directors may appoint.

"4. That the thanks of this meeting be given to the directors, for their conduct in the management of the affairs of the company during the late arduous contest."

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

20885*. There was a resolution of thanks also to the professional men?—Yes, to Messrs. Sweet & Sutton.

20886. In pursuance of one portion of those resolutions, authorizing the directors to call for 2 *l.* a share, was a call made of 1 *l.* a share, in the notice you hold in your hand?—Yes.

20887. Be so good as to read the notice to the Committee?—"The Direct London and Brighton Railway. A call of 2 *l.* per share having been unanimously resolved upon at the general meeting of the subscribers to this undertaking, held at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate-street, on the 18th of October instant, to be paid at such time or times as the directors should appoint; the directors hereby give notice and require the subscribers to pay, between the 12th and 15th of November next inclusive, 1 *l.* per share, being a moiety of such 2 *l.* call, to Messrs. Hankey, bankers, Fenchurch-street, London; or to Messrs. Hall, West & Co., bankers, Brighton, who are authorized to receive and give receipts for the same, upon the subscribers signing the usual Parliamentary contract and subscribers' agreement, which will be left with the bankers for that purpose. All shares upon which the before-mentioned payment shall not be made within the above time limited will become forfeited. By order of the directors, signed H. Dean, secretary; 3, Chapel-place, Poultry, October 21st, 1836."

20888. There is something more, that the new certificates will be ready?—That is on the 27th of October.

20889. On that day was there another notice?—Yes: "Direct London and Brighton Railway. The new certificates will be ready for delivery to the subscribers, in exchange for the bankers' receipts and old scrip, at the office of the company in Chapel-place, Poultry, on and after the 12th of November next. By order of the directors, H. Dean, secretary; 3, Chapel-place, Poultry, October 27th, 1836."

20890. In pursuance of that advertisement of the 21st of October, was the deed sent to Messrs. Hankey, the London bankers, and another part of the same deed to Messrs. Hall & Co., the Brighton bankers?—Yes, there were.

20891. What were the directions given to the bankers on that occasion?—The directions were, that they should receive the 1 *l.* deposit, upon the parties signing the deed, which was left there for that purpose, and inspect the white scrip; whether they did that or not, I do not know.

20892. Were directions given that no persons should be permitted to sign the deed who did not produce the old scrip and pay the deposit?—I think they were so directed; it was a verbal direction.

20893. Did a clerk of the company, or of the solicitors of the company, attend at the London bankers' and at the Brighton bankers' with the deed?—A clerk attended at the London bankers' from Messrs. Sweet & Sutton; who attended at Brighton I do not know.

20894. Was there a notice published November 9th, 1836?—Yes.

20895. That was a notice to the same effect, with respect to persons who chose to sign the deed, at Manchester and Liverpool?—Yes, and that a clerk would be there a certain day.

20896. Was there another part of the deed engrossed and sent into the country, and a clerk of the solicitors sent to Liverpool and Manchester to receive signatures?—Yes, and the deposit.

20897. In pursuance of those notices, the shares subscribed for were 2,413?—2,353 up to the 15th of November.

20898. On the 31st of December last, was there another notice?—Yes, I see one here.

20899. That notice has not been read at all; just read it?—"Direct London and Brighton Railway. The directors think it right to acquaint the public, that the old scrip of this company, dated the 18th of February 1836, is no longer saleable, in consequence of the new scrip, dated the 19th day of October last, having been issued. Subscribers are requested to bring without delay to the company's office the old scrip, and bankers' receipt for the 1 *l.* paid in exchange for the new scrip. Signed, H. Dean, secretary; 3, Chapel-place, Poultry, December 3, 1836."

20900. In the month of January following, did the directors determine on a final period for the limit for the reception of the old scrip?—Yes.

20901. Be so good as to read any notice you have intimating that to the public?—

public?—"The Direct London and Brighton Railway. To holders of the old scrip. Notice is hereby given, that no old scrip will be received in exchange for the new after four o'clock on Wednesday the 18th of January instant, from which time the old scrip will become, by default of the owners, null and void. Attendance will be given daily at the office of the company from ten till four. Signed, H. Dean, secretary. By order of the directors. 3, Chapel-place, Poultry, 11th January 1837."

20902. What was the consequence of that notice; did persons come in?—They came in very speedily in the last two days.

20903. Within the period of that limit, up to the 18th of January, did as many as 12,000 shares come in?—10,659 up to the 18th of January inclusive.

20904. I may as well ask you here, were you aware, or to your knowledge were the directors aware, or are you or they now aware, that the persons who were the holders of the old scrip were not entitled as a matter of right to come in and exchange the old scrip for new, upon signing the deed and paying 1 *l.* deposit?—No, I am not aware of it; on the contrary, I am satisfied that they had the right.

20905. Did the directors, and those acting under them, act under the belief that those who were the holders of the old scrip, whoever they were, were entitled to come in, and upon paying the 1 *l.* deposit, and producing the white scrip, to have the blue scrip?—Yes, decidedly.

20906. I think you have said, that the names that appeared on the old subscribers' deed were vouched in the way you have stated, and were wholly without objection?—Yes, I never heard a doubt expressed upon the subject.

20907. Do you know whether the directors, in point of fact, took advice upon the subject, and were so advised as to the right of the parties to sign the deed?—I am satisfied that they did; they had the advice of their professional gentleman; and it was stated to me that I had no right whatever, and could not refuse, or could not sustain the refusal, if made, to any person who came to sign the deed, on producing the old scrip, and 1 *l.* a share for the call, that I could not refuse to give him the new scrip; and upon that I acted; I did it all myself.

20908. You have mentioned there were some special cases, in which an exception was made, and a permission in those cases given to the parties to subscribe the deed and pay the deposit after the 18th of January?—Yes.

20909. Do you happen to know whether the directors took the advice of counsel upon this very subject of the refusal?—Yes, I have stated so; I know that it was upon the advice of Mr. Pollock, the standing counsel of the company; I am satisfied it was so.

20910. *Chairman.*] Can you produce your counsel's opinion, and the case?—I have it not, the solicitor can produce it perhaps.

20911. Mr. *Clarkson.*] With the exception of some few cases, that presented special circumstances, did the directors allow anybody to sign the deed after the 18th of January, as you have mentioned?—No; none.

20912. There were a certain number of shares that became forfeited?—Yes.

20913. How many were they?—Up to the 28th of January, there would be from 4,000 to 5,000.

20914. For how much was the Parliamentary contract originally signed, at the time of the deposit in the Private Bill Office, on the 2d of February?—£. 991,425.

20915. Then that would, if I understand right, be 391,425 *l.* above the sum required by the Standing Orders?—Yes.

20916. Have you read the Standing Order with reference to subscribing the deeds for companies of this description?—Yes, I have.

20917. Is there anything in that Standing Order having any reference whatever to the payment of money or deposits?—None whatever.

20918. You say there was 391,000 *l.* above the sum required by the Standing Order; could there have been any necessity for any undue means, as far as you are aware of, being used by the directors to increase the subscription of the deed itself?—None whatever; and I am sure none were used.

20919. Now there is capital, as I understand, at present subscribed to the amount of 1,111,275 *l.*?—Yes.

20920. Leaving, of the whole sum to be raised by subscription, only 88,725 *l.* short

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

short of the whole estimate?—Yes; and part of that may be said to be taken, because there is a gentleman who has sent his white scrip for 50 shares, but has not subscribed; he would be allowed to do it when he came.

20921. Is that balance, in your experience, a less one than companies ordinarily retain for allotment to landowners and persons affected by the measure?—I think it a very small quantity, and I have mentioned it to the directors more than once, that I thought we were running very close. There are many persons on the line, landowners, who usually take an interest in it, and for whom it is usual to reserve some shares.

20922. Has that occurred to you since the Committee came to a resolution favourable to this line, and unfavourable to Mr. Stephenson's line?—I hardly know what you allude to.

20923. As to the quantity reserved for landowners?—No, I think it was before that.

20924. Do the letters of allotment and the signatures to the deed of 1836 correspond?—Yes, they do.

20925. Is that, in your judgment, one of the proofs of the care used by the directors in apportioning the allotments?—No, the signatures upon the first occasion followed the allotments; the care that was taken was in allotting the shares.

20926. Does that show this, that the persons by name to whom the shares were allotted were the persons who subscribed the deed?—Yes.

20927. At all events, would it show this, that care was taken that those persons who had had shares allotted to them had not trafficked in and dealt with those shares between the allotment and the subscription of the deed?—I do not believe such a case existed.

20928. Did you receive instructions from the directors, and did you communicate those instructions to the different persons in the establishment, to permit those persons to sign the deed who presented the scrip, upon presenting it and paying the amount of the call upon the shares?—The instructions I received from the directors upon the second deed were merely these: they were to the effect of that advertisement put forth to the public; I managed the scrip part entirely, and I did not feel I was in a situation to refuse any man. I never thought of refusing any man who came properly, in the usual way of business.

20929. You have been asked whether you put certain questions to certain parties, and above all, whether you looked at the men; did you conceive you had any right to question them as to the genuineness of the scrip or their conduct, or as to their age?—Certainly not.

20930. Did you consider you were authorized to do so?—Certainly not.

20931. If anybody who upon the view had presented an appearance that you could not mistake, as a mere boy, for instance, it would have arrested your attention?—Certainly it would.

20932. But, under ordinary circumstances, you took the person who appeared to be the holder of the scrip as the holder of the scrip; you took the white scrip, and gave him the blue scrip, without any questions asked or answered?—Yes, that was the fact.

20933. We have understood that, upon the first occasion, only a small number of shares were subscribed for; did the directors consider that period too short a period?—Yes, to the 15th November.

20934. You have told us that the bankers in London did not like the trouble of having the deed at their places, and occupying the time of their clerks with taking small sums?—I have always understood so, and I was told so on that occasion.

20935. Was it in consequence of that, and that alone, that the deeds were removed from the bankers' to the offices of the company?—Entirely in consequence of that.

20936. I think you have told my learned friend, from the 15th of November to the 11th of January the subscribers did not come in so rapidly; but from that period to the 18th they came in in considerable numbers?—Yes, it was so.

20937. The 17th and 18th more particularly?—Yes, the two last days.

20938. Have you given us the number of shares subscribed for in the course of the 18th?—Between the 11th and 18th I have given it.

20939. 4,873 altogether?—Yes.

20940. You have spoken of special distinctions?—Yes.

20941. Was

20941. Was any person permitted, who presented circumstances of a special nature to your attention, as the secretary, and requesting under those circumstances to be permitted to sign the deed, was any such person permitted to do so, without taking the instructions and directions of the directors upon the subject?—No, I never took that upon myself, certainly.

20942. In many instances, were those special cases the subject of discussion at the board, and of a formal resolution of the board upon them?—I think they were, all of them, except Mr. Moxon, the first of them; and I declare I do not know why it was not in that case; that was the rule always acted upon, except in that case, and I do not know why it was not done there.

20943. Can you tell us about the number of shares that were allowed to be signed for after the 18th of January; I have got it here 1,553 shares?—That was about the number.

20944. And upon which deposits were paid at the time of the subscription?—Certainly.

20945. Upon some occasions, did the holders of the old scrip apply to you for permission to postpone the payment of the deposit upon their shares?—Yes, they did.

20946. Upon those occasions, you have told the Committee that the course was, that they should subscribe the deed, and lodge their old white scrip with you as a matter of security; and that upon some of those occasions you permitted them to do so without paying their deposit?—Yes, and without taking the blue scrip.

20947. Are there any, and, if any, can you tell us what number of persons there were in which you have allowed that indulgence where the blue scrip has not been taken up?—I do not think there is a return of that; I should think about eight or nine parties.

20948. Were some of those parties subscribers who had actually subscribed the deed before the 18th of January?—Yes, the whole I believe; I do not think any were allowed indulgence who had signed after the 18th of January.

20949. Were none of the holders of old scrip permitted by you to sign the deed upon the production of the old scrip, without paying the money and and depositing the old scrip as a security, after the 18th of January?—No, none.

20950. Did you do this as an act authorized by the directors, or take it upon yourself as an accommodation to persons under particular circumstances?—I did that without the knowledge of the directors, without any instructions from the directors; I did it of my own accord, as an act of courtesy to those who asked it of me, and the responsibility of the act rested entirely with myself.

20951. Has the result been, of that indulgence, that the deposits have been afterwards paid?—Yes, all of them.

20952. We have got an account from you, and you say, generally speaking, and particularly on removing from the City to Westminster, the payments were made into the bankers' some days after the payments were made to you at the office?—Yes.

20953. Do you find that the bankers' book kept by them, and the cash-book kept by you, altogether correspond?—Yes.

20954. You sometimes kept the cash back longer, when you received it in cash?—Yes.

20955. Do the payments to the bankers correspond with your cash-book as to the period at which those sums find their way to the bankers'?—Certainly.

20956. And in the instance of Poulton's case, and Mr. Huckvale's, where it appears that the money was retained for more than the ordinary period when you paid it over to the bankers, does it appear to have been paid in to the bankers' when it appears on your cash-book?—Yes, as to Poulton; that is the only case.

20957. You say you do not know that the directors had ever formally examined the accounts or the deed, to see how it was subscribed?—They never formally examined the accounts; they looked at the deed now and then, to see how they stood.

20958. On the occasions of board meetings were the deed and accounts of the company before them?—Yes; they were either before them or ready for their inspection by ringing a bell.

20959. Now I am going to ask you some questions with regard to the direc

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

tors; have you endeavoured to ascertain, as well as you can, the amount of scrip for which each of the directors had signed, and also the amount of new shares subscribed by each of the directors, as a substitute for the old scrip not brought into their respective subscriptions?—Yes, I have.

20960. We will begin with Mr. Crowley; he was the holder of old scrip?—Yes.

20961. Did he on the 15th of last November subscribe the deed for 50 shares?—Yes, he did.

20962. On the 6th of December, did he again subscribe it for 150 more?—Yes.

20963. Did he pay those calls upon those shares?—He paid a call upon 100 shares, not 150, finding he only 100 shares in his possession.

20264. He subscribed for 150, which he thought he had; but upon finding he had only 100, it was altered?—Yes, that was the way in which they stood; he gave 50 old scrip, and paid 100.

20965. Was it altered upon the deed?—No, it was never altered; but in the after-subscription for the 300 shares of the forfeit, Mr. Crowley, standing on the deed a subscriber for 50 shares more than he really possessed, signed the deed for 250, which with that 50 made the 300 for which he signed.

20966. He had 50 short of the number for which he signed when he took the 300?—Yes.

20967. I think the last subscription of 300 shares was before the 28th of January?—About the 28th.

20968. Have all those calls been paid?— Yes.

20969. Did Mr. Sutton at first sign for 210 shares?—Yes, he did.

20970. Afterwards for 203?—For 205.

20971. Afterwards for 200?—Yes.

20972. Afterwards for 320; how many did he subscribe for, if for any, on the 28th of January?—Three hundred, or 320.

20973. On the 28th of January was there 15 more he subscribed for?—Fifteen he subscribed for after the 28th.

20974. Did Mr. Sutton pay all his calls?—He has paid them all.

20975. Now with respect to Mr. Harman; do you find that Mr. Harman has paid all the calls upon all the shares subscribed by him?—Yes.

20976. Amounting to how much in the whole?—Seven hundred.

20977. Mr. Sutton's were 950 in the whole?—I have not added them up; I dare say they are.

20978. Now, Mr. Swabey; did Mr. Swabey's shares amount upon the whole to 490?—Yes.

20979. Has Mr. Swabey paid all the calls upon those 490 shares?—Yes.

20980. Now, Mr. Robinson; do his amount to 345?—Yes, 345.

20981. Has he paid all the calls upon his shares?—Yes.

20982. Mr. J. B. Wilkes?—Yes.

20983. Did his shares amount to 447, or thereabout?—Yes.

20984. Has he paid all the calls upon those shares?—He has.

20985. Mr. Heaviside; his amount to about 70?—Yes; that is the gentleman I wrote the letter to.

20986. He was at Brighton?—Yes.

20987. Did he pay all the calls upon his?—Yes.

20988. Mr. Davis; has he paid all the calls upon his; they amount to about 300?—Three hundred and eighty.

20989. You have been asked about the reason for paying these calls, and so on; were you aware yourself, and were the directors to your knowledge aware, that, although the Standing Orders did not require in terms that the deposit or money should be paid, that the first resolution of the Committee of this Honourable House upon the Bill would require proof of the fact that these deposits upon the shares had been paid?—Certainly.

20990. As far as you are aware, were those the reasons, and the only reasons, why the directors paid up at the time to which you have referred, as contradistinguished from anything that happened at the presentation of Till's petition?—I believe so.

20991. You say, at the time the directors subscribed the deed for the large number of shares that appears upon the list, the funds were ample in the possession of the company; that the directors did not therefore pay those sums until

until the period when it must be proved before a Committee of the House of Commons; is that so?—Just so.

20992. Do you know, or have you the slightest reason to believe, that it was the intention or object of the directors to avoid paying any fraction of the money due from them upon subscribing those shares?—I am sure it was not.

20993. Are the gentlemen, to your knowledge, from what you know and have experienced of them, of substance and respectability?—Certainly.

20994. Mr. Till's petition was presented the 24th?—Yes.

20995. Upon the 25th of April, do you happen to know that the Committee upon the Brighton Railway resolved that Mr. Stephenson's line of railway could not be recommended?—"That," for reasons therein given, "this Committee cannot recommend the House to sanction it."

20996. Read the resolution?—The 25th of April 1837: "As it appears, from the evidence adduced before this Committee, that the termini of Stephenson's line of railway, both at London and Brighton, are inconvenient to the public, that the line is circuitous, and several miles longer than others now under consideration, and that it does not afford facilities of communication with the harbour of Newhaven, the town of Lewes and the eastern parts of Surrey and Sussex, this Committee cannot recommend the House to adopt it.

20997. On the 3d of May, did the same Committee come to another resolution?—Yes.

20998. What was that?—"That the engineering case of the Direct Line of Railway proposed by Sir John Rennie and Mr. Rastrick has been made out to the satisfaction of this Committee, and this Committee recommend that line to the House for adoption."

20999. Did these several resolutions lead you to anticipate that you would very early be examined before the Committee on the Bill?—Yes; I certainly expected it to have happened long before this.

21000. Did you communicate to the directors that you anticipated an early examination about that period?—Yes; I did long before that.

21001. And you wrote a letter to Mr. Heaviside the 4th of April?—Yes.

21002. Now we will go to some of the names impugned: Samuel Carr; had you any reason to know, or had the directors to your knowledge any reason to know, that Samuel Carr was not a *bonâ fide* holder of the 819 and the 500 shares he subscribed for?—No reason whatever.

21003. Whatever transaction or arrangement might have been made between Mr. Carr and any other persons, for the benefit of any other persons, or for the benefit of Mr. Carr, were you and the directors, as far as your knowledge extends, in perfect ignorance of those matters?—Yes, in perfect ignorance.

21004. Did you consider you were entitled or had any right to make any inquiry, of any person who presented these shares, as to his solvency or his means of payment of the calls?—Certainly not.

The *Chairman* stated that the case laid before Mr. Pollock, and his opinion upon the same, should be produced.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated he hoped it would not be called for as his evidence.

The *Chairman* stated that the Committee would call for it, and that would not entitle the parties supporting the petition to any reply.

Mr. *Rowe* stated that that would be giving Mr. Clarkson an advantage which he (Mr. Rowe) thought he ought not to have.

The *Chairman* stated that the Committee always reserved to itself the right to call for any evidence they thought necessary for their own information, as a portion of the documentary evidence.

21005. Mr. *Clarkson.*] On the 18th of January did you happen to be very busily employed?—I was, very indeed.

21006. Do you remember on that day a person describing himself as Mr. Poulton coming to the Poultry to sign for 510 shares?—I recollect a person coming in that name.

21007. Does your memory serve you whether that person was accompanied by another?—Yes.

21008. Was there one other or two others with him?—I think there were two.

21009. Whoever they were, whether they were Mr. Carr or Mr. Huckvale, up to that time did you know anything of them?—Never, in my life.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

21010. Upon that occasion did Mr. Huckvale present to you the old scrip certificates?—Yes.

21011. Did you send him into another room to sign the deed?—Yes, that was done.

21012. Upon his return, did the same person you understood to have been Poulton present to you the old scrip certificates for 510 shares?—Yes; I have no reason to suppose the contrary.

21013. Upon that occasion did you receive from him the 510 *l.* or 110 *l.*?—£. 110, if it was Poulton; or it might be from the others; but I received 110 *l.* and 510 shares, and I gave 110 new scrip.

21014. Did he, upon the occasion of leaving the 400 blue scrip, say he would call in a day and take it up, and did you assent to it?—Yes, I did.

21015. Giving him the 110 shares for which he paid?—Yes.

21016. About 10 days after that arrangement, did any person whom you have since understood to be Huckvale present to you 400 *l.*?—Yes.

21017. Just look at that [*handing a paper to the Witness*], and refresh your memory by it; you have been asked several questions upon the subject of this 400 *l.* payment by Poulton or Huckvale, or whoever paid it; looking at that document, can you assure the Committee with perfect safety that it was upon the 28th of January the 400 *l.* was paid?—Yes.

21018. It was paid to you?—Yes, I received it, or I should not have given that receipt.

21019. And, refreshing your memory by the other document, was the other 110 *l.* paid the 18th of January?—Yes.

21020. Did you know Huckvale or Poulton at that time, or Huckvale from Poulton?—No, I did not.

21021. Were you at that time totally ignorant that any transaction or arrangement whatever had taken place between Huckvale and Poulton, or any other party, with respect to those shares?—Certainly I was.

21022. And, as far as you know, were the directors in the same state of ignorance?—Positively.

21023. Had you any means of knowing, when that person paid the 400 *l.* on the 28th, whether he was the agent or servant or person employed by Poulton?—No; nor should I have thought of inquiring, nor did I. When Poulton left the 400 old scrip with me, he asked me for a memorandum that I held it; I gave it to him, in these words: "Received of B. W. Poulton 400 old scrip in this undertaking." Now, whoever brought me that memorandum and 400 *l.* would have got the blue scrip; and I believe it was Huckvale.

21024. You have already told my learned friend you gave him that memorandum?—Yes, I did.

21025. Now as to William Peters, did Peters subscribe the deed on or about the 18th of January last?—Yes, he did.

21026. Did he produce the old scrip at that time?—Yes.

21027. What passed on that occasion between you and him?—He went and signed the deed in the other office, and came in and gave me his old scrip, and asked me if I could indulge him with a few days to come and pay the call and take his new scrip.

21028. Did you at any time after that apply to him to do so, in consequence of his not doing so?—In consequence of his not doing so in a few days, as he promised, I applied to him.

21029. On the 5th of May did he call again?—On the 5th of May he called upon me.

21030. And tendered the money?—Yes.

21031. Did you accept it or refuse it?—Refused it.

21032. On what ground?—I told him that his character had been very recently impeached by some person in a petition to the House of Commons, and as he had not come before and paid upon his scrip, till I satisfied myself he was a respectable man, I should not let him take the new scrip or pay his money.

21033. He was one of the parties pointed at by the petition?—Yes.

21034. Who sent him on the 5th of May; you do not know if anybody did?—No.

21035. You ultimately declined to let him sign?—I did on that occasion.

21036. It was in consequence of an allegation made against him in a petition to the House?—Yes.

21037. After

21037. After that, did you yourself make personally inquries into the sufficiency and the respectability of this very man Peters?—Yes, I did; he gave me me a reference; and I went and inquired, and satisfied myself he was respectable.

21038. Did you satisfy yourself he was a respectable man, and that the statement in the petition was a false one?—Yes; whatever was the representation against his respectability was a false one, certainly.

21039. On a former occasion, you explained, in answer to a question of the honourable Chairman, that the receipts bore date November in blank, being prepared in expectation of the payments being made to a more considerable extent in November; and when that was found not to be the case, the date was erased?—Yes; it was filled in, for the convenience of the bankers, by my clerk; and I also added, that those receipts were prepared for the first occasion, which accounts for the interlineation in them.

21040. You found, upon inquiries you made yourself, that Mr. Peters was a respectable person?—Yes.

21041. Having so discovered, did you permit him to sign the deed and exchange the scrip?—Yes; I had no possible reason for refusing him after that.

21042. It was Mr. Stephen's petition that impeached his name?—Yes, I believe it was; whatever it was, I told him at that time.

21043. Now as to three persons of the name of Alexander Melville, Thomas Elliman and Taylor, do you remember that my learned friend Mr. Austin, on examining you upon the subject of certain deposits, obtained from you the fact, that those three persons were to be distinguished from the list with which you furnished him upon that occasion, and for the reasons you were about to give?—Yes, that was a list of parties who had subscribed the deed after the 2d of February, and yet did not appear in the cash-book; that is what I wanted to explain, when I was stopped at the time.

21044. Be so good as to give us any explanation you have to give as to those three names?—They were three parties, I believe, residing in the country, and they sent up the scrip to their friends in town a considerable time ago, to bring it to the office, and do what was necessary; but when they got to the office, those parties said to me, "These are not ours; they belong to so and so, in the country;" I said, "You cannot sign for them, I cannot permit any such thing; if your friend cannot come to town, he must send a sealed power of attorney; because no one shall sign this deed, which is a sealed instrument, without a sealed power of attorney."

21044.* Some parties have signed by power of attorney?—Yes, six or seven.

21045. Did Mr. Taylor afterwards come up from the country to subscribe the deed?—He came all the way from Bristol.

21046. And the other two gentlemen?—No; I think Mr. Melville's was by power of attorney; he is a gentleman who lives in Scotland, a Dr. Melville.

21047. Attend to my question; did Mr. Taylor complain bitterly of the expense and trouble to which he had been put, in being compelled to do so?—He did.

21048. Mr. Elliman lives at Tring, in Hertfordshire, and Mr. Melville in Scotland?—I think he does.

21049. I rather think you have already given the Committee an account of the transaction as it regards Mackay, is it so?—Yes.

21050. Have you any further explanation you desire to give to the Committee on the subject of Mackay's subscription?—I should like to know what I have said.

21051. Now as to Frederick Warner, I do not know whether, individually, you have given any explanation of that case?—I think I did yesterday, in the same way as Mackay.

21052. Mr. Warner it appears subscribed the deed on behalf of Mr. Williams; do you know Mr. Williams?—Very intimately.

21053. Is he a wealthy man?—He is.

21054. You have explained the circumstance of the state in which Mr. Williams was upon that occasion; you said his wife was dying that afternoon, and did die early the following morning?—That is the fact.

21055. Were you at all aware at the time of the transaction by Warner, as he represents it now on the part of Mr. Williams, from the conversation that passed between you and Mr. Williams, in and out of your office, that Mr. Wil-

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

liams was not the person who had signed the deed?—No; I took for granted it was Mr. Williams who had signed; I never saw Mr. Warner; I did not know he was in the house.

21056. Among the list of subscribers since the 2d of February, which you have delivered in to the Committee, on the 11th of May there appears John Jackson, a subscriber for 70 shares?—Yes.

21057. Was that John Jackson a subscriber previous to that time, or was it another John Jackson?—That was a different man altogether; this John Jackson was under special circumstances, and lived at Lancaster; he made out a case which induced the directors to instruct me to exchange his 70 shares.

21058. He lives at Lancaster?—I believe he does; he so described himself to me.

21059. Have you every reason to believe him to be a highly respectable man?—Yes, I believe so.

21060. The Jackson on the printed list describes himself as of Dorset-crescent?—Yes.

21061. A totally different person?—Yes, that is one; the man I mean came up all the way from Lancaster to sign the deed; he would not send a power of attorney, and I made him come up.

21062. Now, have the kindness to turn your recollection, as well as you can, to the case of Northcote; he has stated that he went to sign the deed for his father, and so told you, and that you told him if he paid in a day or two that would do, as his father he represented was not in town; have you any recollection of such a thing?—None whatever; and it is so highly improbable that it should have taken place, I am satisfied it never did; I am satisfied he never communicated that fact to me, that he signed for his father.

21063. He has stated that he paid the money three weeks after he signed the deed; he signed the deed, as it appears, upon the 18th of January; looking at that paper [*handing one to the Witness*], and refreshing your memory by it, tell the Committee when, in point of fact, he paid the money?—On the 2d of February.

21064. If those circumstances have been disclosed to you by Mr. Northcote, that he came to sign the deed for his father, and asking indulgence in the way described, should you have permitted him to sign the deed?—I certainly should not have permitted him to sign the deed; if he had signed the deed and asked an indulgence for a day or two, I should have given it him, as I did to others.

21065. If he had left the scrip and signed the deed, you would have let him have a day or two before the money was paid?—Yes, very probably I should.

21066. Now, I will ask you, generally, with respect to Billett, or any other persons who it may turn out have subscribed the deed for others than themselves, were you at the time of the subscription aware that they did so, or, if you were aware of it, should you have permitted it?—I was not aware of it; and I would not have permitted any man who told me he was not interested in the shares to have signed the deed.

21067. Now, as to the directors; did the directors at all interfere, personally or as a body, in the time or manner of signing the deed, excepting the general directions given to you?—No, they did not interfere at all; I managed it entirely under their instruction; they left it to me.

21068. Does your Committee upon the Bill meet this day for the purpose of going on with the Bill itself?—They meet to-day to consider the report of the engineers, I believe; that is, as to which line shall be recommended to the House.

21069. Here is an instance of a man of the name of Stride, who says he saw you, and signed the deed at the instance of one of his masters, a Mr. Wilson, and you asked him no questions; was it your habit or practice to ask questions of persons who came to sign the deed, or did you permit them to subscribe under your then and present belief that they were entitled?—Certainly.

21070. You had no means of knowing that the persons who presented themselves were other than the *bonâ fide* holders of the scrip?—No, I had not.

21071. Are you acquainted with the station in life, and circumstances or reputed circumstances, of the gentlemen who form the direction of this company?—Yes, I am.

21072. To your knowledge, are they persons capable of lending themselves, either

either individually or generally, to any fraud or attempt at fraud of any description?—Totally incapable of it.

21073. Was the undertaking from the commencement one that it was contemplated and intended *bonâ fide* to carry into execution?—It was; and is.

21074. Was it your opinion, and, as far as you learnt, the opinion of the directors, that it would be a profitable undertaking when carried into execution?—We entertain a very confident expectation that it will be, certainly.

21075. We have had some evidence elicited from you upon the subject of some shares that the directors declared to be forfeited, which they afterwards appropriated to themselves; the white scrip for those shares never came back to the company?—Never.

21076. Has this blue scrip, upon which these several calls of 1 *l.* each have been paid, been delivered to the directors, or were they ever contemplated to be delivered to the directors?—Some have been delivered to the directors in the last two or three months, when they chose to pay for them, and two of the gentlemen have got some.

21077. Have the goodness to explain to the Committee the conditions upon which the directors agreed to take those shares after this limit?—The directors considered that those shares which were forfeited, or part of them, should be subscribed for on the deed; and, as they were low in the market, they decided, under all the circumstances of the case, it would be better for the company that they should take a portion of them amongst themselves, with a general agreement amongst themselves that they were not to be made use of or sent into the market, or done anything with, but remain in my custody for two or three months from that time; and, accordingly they did remain so, all of them, until very recently.

21078. Do you believe it was any other motive, or any other object than their own confidence in the undertaking that induced them to divide the shares among them?—I am certain it was not; it was taking upon themselves very heavy responsibility.

21079. Are the directors fully able to meet the responsibility they have so taken upon themselves?—Yes, certainly.

21080. Are you aware, or do you believe, that there is any person petitioning to this Committee upon the subject of this Line in any way interested for the public, except so far as Stephenson's opposition Line can be considered interested for the public?—No, I am not aware that any party is; I do not know even who the parties are.

21081. Are you aware of any means resorted to by the directors, or those under them, directly or indirectly, either to withdraw from the market shares, or to force shares upon the market, or to resort to any means whatever improperly to obtain signatures to the deed of subscription?—I am not aware of any such circumstance, and I am very certain it never took place; I think they are altogether incapable of doing any such thing.

21082. And, in respect to the mode of transacting your part of the duty imposed upon you by the directors, have you carefully and faithfully performed that duty as you were directed?—I have.

21083. Have you in any respect lent yourself to any means of advancing the interests of this company by any undue mode whatever?—None whatever; I never thought of such a thing.

21084. Or any other officer, to your knowledge?—None whatever.

21085. And is the concern, if it shall please Parliament to permit it, intended *bonâ fide* to be carried into execution?—Positively.

Re-examined by Mr. *Rowe.*

21086. You say some of these directors have received this blue scrip?—Yes, two.

21087. To what amount; and the names; who are the directors?—Mr. Wilks, 300 shares; Mr. Crowley, 300; Mr. Harman, 100; I have his other 300 in my box.

21088. No one else, are you quite sure?—Yes, Mr. Robert Sutton.

21089. How many has he had?—Three hundred, whatever he subscribed for.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

21090. The whole amount taken on the 28th?—Yes.

21091. Mr. Swabey, has he had his?—Yes, he has had his.

21092. Has Mr. Benjamin Davis had his?—No.

21093. Sir William Jolliffe?—No.

21094. Mr. Heaviside, he had none?—No.

21095. Mr. Robinson?—He did not have his.

21096. Matthias Wilks?—He had not any.

21097. Then do I understand you, with the exception of Mr. Harman, all those gentlemen have had the whole amount of those taken on the 28th?—Yes.

21098. Can you tell me when they had them?—I should think when they appear to have paid, or soon afterwards; Mr. Harman had his about the 12th of May.

21099. That you know?—Yes.

21100. Are you in a position to be able to tell me whether the scrip was given up at that time?—Yes.

21101. *Chairman.*] And not till then?—Not before.

21102. Mr. *Rowe.*] These sums of money have been paid up at different times, by the different parties; some have paid much earlier than others?—Yes, but none of those parties got their new scrip till they paid the money.

21103. But some of those parties paid before the 24th of April, and some since?—Yes.

21104. What became of the agreement that you were to hold them two or three months; would they not have had them directly, if they had paid?—No.

21105. They took them the 28th of January, and you will find that Mr. Sutton and Mr. Wilks both paid before the 24th of April?—Yes.

21106. Did you tell them that the two or three months had not expired?—No, I did not.

21107. Why did you not?—Because I did not think it any business of mine, in the first place, to tell them; and in the next place, the two or three months had expired.

21108. Suppose the payment made the 21st of April by Mr. Sutton, and the 28th of January the day of signing?—That is three months, in my calculation, within a week.

21109. *Chairman.*] When was it that this understanding was come to, that the shares should be held for two or three months?—When they signed the deed, the 28th of January.

21110. Mr. *Rowe.*] Was there any minute to that effect?—No.

21111. Were you present?—Yes.

21112. Was it at a board meeting?—Yes.

21113. Can you tell whether the price of the shares was lower then than when you delivered up the blue scrip?—I do not know the price.

21114. Do you not know that Sir John Rennie's shares were at a higher price the 24th of April than they were in January?—I do not think they have been lower in the market than they were in the last three or four weeks.

21115. I am speaking of the 24th of April?—I do not know.

21116. I understood you to say that you did not consider yourself authorized to refuse any one that came?—That came properly.

21117. What induced you to refuse Mr. Peters, if he came with scrip in his hand?—I have told you.

21118. What?—His character had been impeached in a petition to the House of Commons, and I thought that a very fair ground for me to exercise my discretion.

21119. What becomes of the legal opinion?—I thought that was a proper guide, and I do not know that I thought of the legal opinion.

21120. You understood that you could not refuse, but you did refuse?—Yes, I did, for the reason stated, and I should refuse others under similar circumstances.

21121. He signed the deed at that time?—He signed on the 18th of January, and brought me the old scrip, and said he would come in a few days and take his new scrip and pay for them; he did not come, and I subsequently applied to him; some time elapsed, and I wrote to him again, and he wrote in answer and stated he had been a long time in the country; I did not see him till the 5th

5th of May, and that was after the petition had been presented to the House of Commons, impeaching his respectability and credibility, and I thought that a sufficient reason, till I satisfied myself that the petition was true or false. I satisfied myself that the charge was not true; that he was a respectable man, and good for the amount against his name; and I took his money and gave him the new scrip.

21122. With respect to the directors, are you acquainted with all of them individually?—Only in the last twelve months.

21123. For instance, Mr. Robinson, are you acquainted with him?—Yes; with Mr. Heaviside, Mr. Wilks and Mr. Davis.

21124. You are acquainted with them personally, and know something of their affairs?—Yes.

21125. You say you brought up Mr. Jackson from Lancaster?—I think he came up in consequence of my refusing to let that other person sign for him.

21126. When was that?—He was one of the excepted cases; it is somewhere about the 7th of February; the money was paid upon the 7th of February.

21127. It was about that time?—Yes.

21128. *Chairman.*] I understood, with respect to the first deed, that no parties were allowed to sign it but those to whom shares had been allotted by the directors?—Yes.

21129. Mr. *Rowe.*] I presume you gave both these receipts yourself?—They are both my signature.

21130. This receipt you had given to Mr. Huckvale ought to be in Mr. Huckvale's possession; how is it it is in yours?—I thought that I explained that before; the right of the parties holding the old scrip to get the new scrip was their exchanging the bankers' receipt.

21131. This is not the bankers'?—No, but it is mine; and the process was not altered by me; the bankers merely endorsed the receipt to show they got the scrip.

21132. So that you got the exact date of the payment when the process at the bankers' was over; and when the party came to you at the Poultry, he got the receipt there?—No, that was given at the bankers'.

21133. Was that the receipt given to Huckvale for 400 *l.*?—That receipt was not given at the bankers'.

21134. It was given by you?—Yes.

21135. Was that the course of business, that you always drew up such a receipt?—Yes.

21136. These were all handed back again?—Yes.

21137. You had a very easy mode of ascertaining each day on which every sum was paid?—Yes.

21138. Have you not got in your hands vouchers that will enable you to give the exact day upon which every sum was paid?—I never expressed any doubt about it.

21139. Have we not been examining into the cash-book, which you say does not give an accurate account when you had the receipts in your possession?—I did not say so; it does give an accurate account, with this exception, that at Westminster there is a difference of a day or two.

21140. When you had this very information in your possession, why did you not give us this information?—I never dreamt of such a thing; I did not understand such a thing.

21141. You have told us that that cash-book of yours will not give the exact date upon which the payments were made to you, and there has been a great doubt about the payments, as it only gives the day of payment into the bankers'; have we not been inquiring the exact day at which the payment was made to you?—Yes.

21142. Then I wish to know, when you had in your possession all those receipts, which would give the very exact day when the money came into your hands, why were they not produced?—They have been all produced.

21143. I have not seen them before?—Mr. Austin had as many as 20 in his hands the day I was first here.

21144. Have you referred to those receipts to get the exact day?—No.

21145. You have given in to-day the parties who had signed between certain days; have you verified the day of that payment by the receipt or cash-book?—No, I have put it down from the cash-book.

Mr. *Henry Dean.*

23 May 1837.

The *Chairman* suggested that the receipts should be produced by one party for the company, and examined by one party on behalf of the petitioners, and the returns compared with the receipts.

21146. If two parties came together, and you found that one party indorsed the receipt and received it from another, and you found that one of those parties signed and the other gave a receipt, would that engender any suspicion in your mind that it was not a proper presentation of the party?—I do not understand the question.

21147. If two parties came, one signed the deed and another indorsed the receipt as for the party that signed the deed, would that circumstance raise suspicion in your mind?—Certainly not a bit; a man had a clear right to do it.

21148. Supposing both parties present, one signs the deed and the other indorses in the presence of the party who has signed, "Received, for B. W. Poulton, Robert Huckvale," that would not raise any suspicion?—No, it has been done 50 times, I have no doubt of it; and with respect to who signs the deed, I do not know that; that is done in another office; and it has happened repeatedly that the principal has come with his broker, and that man would sign the deed as the principal, and in that way I have no doubt that Mr. Huckvale's was viewed in my mind.

21149. Supposing you did not know the party to be a broker, would not it excite some suspicion in your mind that Poulton should sign the deed, Huckvale should sign the receipt?—No, not at all.

21150. You were aware that Poulton had signed the deed at the time for 510 shares?—Yes.

21151. There is one point that I wish to clear up, that I may not misunderstand you by-and-bye; what was the course at the bankers'; was the party who appeared at the bankers' bound to deliver the white scrip at the bankers', or simply to show it?—He did not leave it there.

21152. Was he bound to show it?—I think he was.

21153. Was he bound to do it; because you have given two different accounts of it?—I spoke from memory then, as I do now; I do not recollect the exact instructions; they were probably required to receive the deposit, after the deed being signed, and it might be upon the production of the white scrip.

21154. Do you mean to adhere to this answer then, that a party going to the bankers' under the second instructions, tendering them 1 *l.* for every share claimed, and signing the deed lying at the bankers', was entitled to a receipt; you answered, "Yes;" you adhere to that answer?—Yes.

21155. And it was not necessary to show the scrip?—I do not know that it was necessary.

21156. My learned friend has laid some stress upon your cash-book; you have stated to my learned friend that the cash-book and the bankers' book tally; have you not stated more than once that your cash-book was a copy of the bankers' book, and not a check?—Yes.

21157. And with regard to Rennie's Line, are you not aware that the same sort of resolution was passed the last Session as to Mr. Stephenson's, and the Bill passed the Commons?—Yes, I am aware of that.

[The Witness withdrew.

It was agreed that Wettenall's List should be referred to, provided it was before the Committee at the time the reference was made to it.

It appeared, on reference to Wettenall's List, that the price of Rennie's stock on the 31st of January was, (3 *l.* paid,) 2, $1\frac{7}{8}$, $2\frac{1}{8}$, and $1\frac{3}{8}$.

Mercurii, 24° die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

24 May 1837.

Mr. *Rowe* called for the production of the receipt given by Edward Hill.

The same was produced, and handed to Mr. Rowe.

Mr. *Rowe* called for the receipt given by Mr. Williams (Warner's receipt.)

The same was produced, and handed to Mr. Rowe.

Mr. *Rowe* applied that the whole of the receipts produced should be handed in for the inspection of the Committee; particularly, he wished now to have those given on the 17th and 18th of January, also the 28th of January and the 24th of April.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, with respect to the case for an opinion of Mr. Pollock, alluded to yesterday, that on searching among the papers of the company, there had been found a variety of cases and opinions, embracing a variety of subjects, but none particularly confined to the question under discussion yesterday, and that he held in his hand a letter received this morning from Mr. Pollock, which he would hand to the Committee.

The letter was handed to the Chairman, from which it appeared that there had been no case submitted to Mr. Pollock, and no opinion given in writing upon the point in question.

Mr. *Rowe* desired, that as Blackmore, Fielding and Moring had not attended to their summonses, that the Committee would take into consideration the evidence given with respect to those individuals in the Deptford and Dover and the South Midland cases.

Mr. *Clarkson* assented to the suggestion of Mr. Rowe, and stated that, as to all persons who had been summoned, or who could be stated to have been summoned, the same course might be pursued, and that the deed might be referred to for the sums put against their names; and also admitted that Poulton had been shown, in other cases, to have been paid for signing other deeds.

Mr. *Rowe* was heard, to observe upon the evidence adduced in support of the Petitioners, for whom he appeared.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

No. 1.—Petition of Henry Cooke, 24 April 1837 - - - - - - p. 179
No. 2.—Petition of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, 24 April 1837 - - - p. 179
No. 3.—Petition of Provisional Committee, &c., 24 April 1837 - - - p. 180
No. 4.—Petition of Richard Lill, Esq., 24 April 1837 - - - - - p. 180
No. 5.—Petition of James Slatford Vale, 26 April 1837 - - - - p. 182
No. 6.—Petition of Daniel Edward Stephens, 28 April 1837 - - - - p. 182
No. 7.—Petition of Samuel Carr, 28 April 1837 - - - - - - p. 184
No. 8.—Petition of Richard Blackmore, 1 May 1837 - - - - - p. 184
No. 9.—Petition of John Haley, 1 May 1837 - - - - - - p. 185
No. 10.—Petition of William Cooke, 1 May 1837 - - - - - - p. 185
No. 11.—Petition of George Walker, 1 May 1837 - - - - - p. 186
No. 12.—Petition of Robert Huckvale and others, 1 May 1837 - - - p. 186
No. 13.—Petition of Joseph Thompson, 1 May 1837 - - - - - p. 187
No. 14.—Parliamentary Contract - - - - - - - - - p. 188
No. 15.—Subscribers' Agreement - - - - - - - - - p. 189
No. 16.—Parliamentary Contract without the Signatures - - - - p. 190
No. 17.—Subscribers' Agreement without the Signatures - - - - p. 191
No. 18.—Subscription List for Session 1836 - - - - - - p. 194
No. 19.—List of Subscribers, 1837 - - - - - - - - p. 201
No. 20.—A List of the Persons who were Subscribers on the Old Deed, and are also Subscribers on the New Deed, and the Sums subscribed by them, as well upon the Old as upon the New Deed - - - - - - - - p. 205
No. 21.—Statement as to the Shares declared to be null and void, by default of the Holders, on 18 January 1837 - - - - - - - - p. 206
No. 22.—Advertisement, 9 November 1836 - - - - - - - - p. 207

APPENDIX.

DIRECT LONDON AND BRIGHTON RAILWAY (RENNIE'S LINE).

Appendix, No. 1.

PETITION of *Henry Cooke*.—24 April 1837.

No. 1.
Petition of Henry Cooke.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Henry Cooke*, now a prisoner in Whitecross-street Prison, late of Grove Place, Holloway, in the county of Middlesex, Stock Jobber,

Sheweth,

That your petitioner signed a parliamentary deed, called "The Direct London and Brighton Railway," for 225 shares.

That 125 shares in the said company were the property of one J. Whitton, of the Stock Exchange, who paid your petitioner the sum of 2*l.* for so executing the said deed.

That 100 shares in the said company were the property of R. Huckvale, also of the Stock Exchange, who paid your petitioner the sum of 1*l.* 10*s.* for so executing the said deed.

That your petitioner never paid any deposits on the shares, although he appears on the deed to have so signed for 250.

That your petitioner described himself of 8, Houndsditch, gentleman.

That your petitioner is ready and willing to come before the House, and state all the circumstances he is in possession of relative to the said company.

Your petitioner therefore prays the Honourable House will not inflict on him any punishment for having executed the said deeds, as he did it not knowing that he was doing wrong, and being ready and willing to account to the Honourable House for so doing.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 2.

PETITION of *Benjamin Wheeler Poulton*.—24 April 1837.

No. 2.
Petition of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned *Benjamin Wheeler Poulton*, of Belinda-street, Canonbury-square, gentleman,

Sheweth,

That your petitioner was applied to in the month of January last by Samuel Carr, of the Stock Exchange, to sign the parliamentary subscription contract for the direct line of the railroad from London to Brighton, on the plan laid down by Sir John Rennie, the said Samuel Carr having told your petitioner that he the said Samuel Carr had already signed the said contract to a very considerable amount, and he stated that your petitioner should be paid for so doing.

That in consequence of this application your petitioner went to the office of the said railway company at Chapel-place in the Poultry, and whilst at the office of the company in Chapel-place aforesaid, a person of the name, as your petitioner believes, of Vale, who is on the Stock Exchange, handed to your petitioner a bundle of certificates in the presence of the said Samuel Carr and the clerks of the company; that your petitioner handed the certificates to the clerk of the company, and then signed the said deed for the sum of 38,750*l.*; that no person witnessed the signature of your petitioner in his presence; that Samuel Carr and your petitioner then went into another room, and the certificates were there delivered by Mr. Vale to a clerk sitting at a desk, and Vale said, "This is Mr. Poulton who has signed the deed;" that Mr. Vale then said to Carr, "I shall see you at four o'clock," and your petitioner then retired with Carr.

That your petitioner never dealt in or bought any shares in the said company, and never paid any deposit on any share in the said company, and both Carr and Vale were perfectly aware of that fact.

No. 2.
Petition of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton.

That your petitioner received a sovereign from the said Samuel Carr for signing the deed.

That your petitioner is prepared to prove the above facts, either at the Bar of your Honourable House, or before a Committee thereof, and your petitioner humbly prays for the protection of your Honourable House in proving and disclosing the facts and circumstances above stated.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 3.

No. 3.
Petition of Provisional Committee, &c. &c.

PETITION of Provisional Committee, &c. &c.—24 April 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Members of a Provisional Committee, Solicitors, and Secretary of a Company, formed for promoting a Railway from London to Brighton, with branches to Shoreham, Lewes and Newhaven, called "The Direct London and Brighton Railway,"

Sheweth,

That your petitioners have ascertained that a petition from the provisional directors of a company formed for promoting a circuitous line of railway from London to Brighton, commonly called "Mr. Stephenson's Line," has been prepared, and is about to be presented to your Honourable House, impugning the validity and *bona fides* of the subscription list for the Direct Line, and seeking for some Parliamentary inquiry upon the subject of it.

That your petitioners, collectively and individually, humbly beg to assure your Honourable House, most solemnly and distinctly, that the Parliamentary contract for the Direct Line was got up and signed in the most fair, open and impartial manner, and that the subscription list is a *bonâ fide* one, and that neither your petitioners, nor any other person or persons by or on their behalf, or with their consent or knowledge, or acting under their authority directly or indirectly, gave any premium or other consideration, promise or reward, to any person or persons whomsoever, for the purpose of inducing them to sign such Parliamentary contract.

That there are two other competing lines of railway to Brighton, besides the Direct Line and Mr. Stephenson's, and that the whole of the lines have been under the consideration of a Committee of your Honourable House ever since the 3d day of March last, and that the whole of the engineering evidence on each line has been gone through, and the Committee are to meet to morrow (Tuesday), the 25th of April, to decide upon them.

That the petition for a bill for the Direct Line was presented on the 1st day of February last, and that before the same was presented, a copy of the subscription contract for that line was deposited at the Private Bill Office, as required by the Standing Orders of your Honourable House; and that, notwithstanding nearly three months have elapsed since such deposit was made, no objection has been made or proposed to be made to the same until the eve of the day when the Committee are to come to a determination on the case.

That your petitioners therefore cannot but believe that this course has been taken by the promoters of Mr. Stephenson's Line for the purpose of delay, and for the purpose of preventing any bill from passing during the present session of Parliament, and of prejudicing the minds of the Committee against your petitioners, previous to the decision that will be come to to-morrow; particularly as, under the Standing Orders of your Honourable House, it is the duty of the Committee to which the bills are referred, to report specially upon the validity and sufficiency of the Parliamentary contracts.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray, That if your Honourable House be not satisfied of the utter falsity of the allegations against your petitioners, your Honourable House will specially instruct the Committee, to which the Brighton Railway Bills are referred, to examine into the circumstances and report to your Honourable House.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 4.

No. 4.
Petition of Richard Lill, Esq.

PETITION of *Richard Lill*, Esq.—24 April 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Secretary to the Provisional Committee, for forming a Railway from London to Brighton, by way of Shoreham, on the Line called Stephenson's Line,

Sheweth,

That the said committee are interested in the success of a bill now pending before Parliament in your Honourable House, intituled, "A Bill for making a Railway to join the London and Southampton Railway, near London, and to form a communication between London and Brighton, by way of Shoreham, on what is termed Stephenson's Line."

That

No. 4.
Petition of Richard Lill, Esq.

That a bill is also now in progress before your Honourable House, intituled, "A Bill for making a Railway from the London and Croydon Railway to Brighton, with branches to Shoreham, Newhaven and Lewes," and which is called Rennie's line.

That your petitioner has examined the list of subscribers to the subscription contract for carrying the said last-mentioned undertaking (if sanctioned by Parliament) into effect.

That amongst the names of such subscribers there appears the name of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, described of Staines-road, Hounslow, gentleman, who appears a subscriber to the said undertaking for the sum of 38,250 *l.*

That the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton does not reside at Staines-road aforesaid, and no such person is known to reside there, or in the neighbourhood.

That the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton was paid a sovereign for signing this subscription contract by Samuel Carr, the person hereafter named.

That the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton is a person perfectly unable to pay any such sum as 38,250 *l.*; and that Benjamin Wheeler Poulton paid no deposit on signing the said deed, and was unable to do so.

That it has been proved that the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton received the sum of 4 *s.* for subscribing his name to the Deptford and Dover Railway undertaking, for the purpose of making up a sufficient subscription to satisfy the Standing Orders of your Honourable House.

That, on the subscription list for the said Rennie's Line, there also appears the name of William Cooke, with a description of Keppel Row, Stoke Newington, subscribing for the sum of 17,400 *l.*; and also the name of Henry Cooke, of No. 8, Houndsditch, who appears as a subscriber for 16,875 *l.*

That your petitioner has ascertained that the said Henry Cooke, described as at No. 8, Houndsditch, does not reside nor carry on any business there; that the house, No. 8, Houndsditch, was lately occupied by Mrs. Wilson, as a dancing academy; that Henry Cooke, aforesaid, is the brother of the said Mrs. Wilson, and your petitioner is informed the said Henry Cooke is now a prisoner for debt in Whitecross-street prison; and further, your petitioner has ascertained that William Cooke aforesaid, lives in an obscure house in Keppel Row, Stoke Newington; that he is the father of the said Henry Cooke, and of the said Mrs. Wilson, and your petitioner is informed that the said Henry Cooke was a subscriber to the Deptford and Dover Railway for considerable sums, and received the sum of 4 *s.* for subscribing the said deed.

That, among other subscribers to the said subscription contract for the line called Rennie's line, there appears the name of Alfred Rider, described as of Cold-harbour-lane, Camberwell, for the sum of 9,750 *l.*

That your petitioner has ascertained that the only person of the name of Rider, residing in Cold-harbour-lane, Camberwell, is a washerwoman apparently in very indigent circumstances, and who stated to your petitioner that Alfred Rider is her son, and that he is a clerk; but she refused to tell where he resided, or to give the name of the person to whom he is a clerk.

That, in the said deed of subscription for the same line, the following names and descriptions appear:

	Amount of Subscription. £.
Samuel Carr, Stock Exchange, Gent.	375
Samuel Carr, Stock Exchange, Gent.	8,250
Samuel Carr, Stock Exchange, Gent.	61,425
Samuel Carr, Upper Charles-street, Northampton-square, Gent.	37,500

and which several subscriptions amount to 107,550 *l.*, and your petitioner is prepared to prove that the said several subscriptions are made by one and the same person.

That your petitioner has ascertained that the said Samuel Carr, who was formerly of the Stock Exchange, was, in the year 1836, the year in which the said recited deed was signed, so poor, that he could not pay the annual sum of ten guineas as a member of the Stock Exchange; and after repeated promises and solicitations for time, on the score of poverty, he was at last reported to the manager of the Stock Exchange, in default of his annual subscription; and that, in consequence of such inability to pay his subscription, he is no longer a member of the Stock Exchange; and your petitioner verily believes that the said Samuel Carr, late of the Stock Exchange, is the same person who signed the deed for the sum of 107,550 *l.* And your petitioner is informed and believes, that the said Samuel Carr received sums of money as a consideration for signing the said deed.

That a person of the name of John Jackson, who describes himself as of No. 14, Dorset-crescent, gentleman, has signed the said contract for Rennie's line for the sum of 1,500 *l.*, and a person of the name of Richard Blackmore, who describes himself as of Trafalgar-place, West, Hackney-road, broker, has signed the said contract for 750 *l.*; that your petitioner is also informed and believes, that the said John Jackson and Richard Blackmore are persons in very distressed circumstances, and that they have signed other subscription deeds for railways to very considerable amounts, and for which they were respectively paid a consideration.

That there also appears on the said subscription contract the name of George Walker, described of No. 7, Old Change, draper, who has signed the said deed for 2,625 *l.*, and that the said George Walker is a common porter in a warehouse.

That your petitioner is informed and believes, that various other persons have signed the said

No. 4.
Petition of Richard Lill, Esq.

said deed for Rennie's line, for considerable sums, who are not worthy of the credit of your Honourable House, for the sums for which they have respectively signed in support of the said undertaking, and that some of such subscribers have been induced to sign the said deed by misrepresentation, or in consideration of money paid to them.

That the Committee doubt not they shall be able to prove the allegations of this petition at the bar or before any Committee of your Honourable House.

That it is within the last few days only, and since the Committee has been sitting on the Bill for Rennie's line, that your petitioner has become acquainted with the facts herein set forth.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays, that your Honourable House will be pleased to cause this gross fraud upon and violation of the privileges of your Honourable House to be inquired into, and grant such relief in the premises as to your Honourable House shall think proper.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 5.

No. 5.
Petition of James Vale.

PETITION of *James Slatford Vale.*—26 April 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament Assembled.

The humble Petition of James Slatford Vale, of the Stock Exchange, London, Stockbroker.

Sheweth,

That your petitioner has read the petition of Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, presented to your Honourable House on the 24th of April instant, alleging that a person of the name (as the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton believed) of Vale who was in the Stock Exchange, handed to the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton a bundle of certificates in the presence of Samuel Carr and the clerks of the Direct London and Brighton Railway; that the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton handed the certificates to the clerk of the company, and then signed the deed for 38,750 *l.*; that no person witnessed the signature of the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton in his presence; that Samuel Carr and the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton then went into another room, and the certificates were then delivered by Mr. Vale to a clerk sitting at a desk, and Vale said, "This is Mr. Poulton who has signed the deed;" that Mr. Vale then said to Carr, "I shall see you at four o'clock," and the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton then retired with Carr; and also alleging that the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton never dealt in or bought any shares in the said company, and never paid any deposit on any share in the said company, and that both Carr and Vale were aware of that fact.

That your petitioner is the only person on the Stock Exchange of the name of Vale.

That your petitioner denies any knowledge of the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton whatever, and, to the best of his knowledge, never saw the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton in his life.

That your petitioner never went to the office of the Direct London and Brighton Railway Company, either alone, or with the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, or any other person in his life; and denies most solemnly and distinctly the allegations contained in the petition of the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton, so far as regards your petitioner, and states that they are totally and absolutely false.

Your petitioner therefore craves leave to lay the above facts before your Honourable House, and humbly prays your Honourable House to act in the premises as to your Honourable House shall seem meet.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 6.

No. 6.
Petition of Daniel Edward Stephens.

PETITION of *Daniel Edward Stephens.*—28 April 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Daniel Edward Stephens*, of Chingford, in the County of Essex, gentleman.

Sheweth,

That the promoters of an undertaking called "The Direct London and Brighton Railway Company" have introduced a Bill into your Honourable House, with a view to get it passed into a law, to authorize them to carry their line of railway into effect.

That your petitioner is a shareholder in the Direct London and Brighton Railway for twenty shares, has directed his attention to the list of subscribers deposited in the Private Bill Office, and has examined the names of persons appearing thereon as subscribers to the Parliamentary deed for large sums of money, some of whom, to the knowledge of your petitioner, are in very humble circumstances of life and unable to pay the same.

That your petitioner humbly calls the attention of your Honourable House to the following cases, amounting, in the Direct London and Brighton Railway Company's deed, to the sum of 183,450 *l.*, which your petitioner believes are only a small proportion of those who have subscribed to the said contract deed under similar circumstances; viz.

NAME.	Place of Abode.	Quality or Calling.	No. of Shares.	Amount of Subscriptions.	OBSERVATIONS.
				£.	
1. Samuel Carr -	*Stock Exchange -	gent. -	5	375	- - this person has signed the deed four times, and most of the shares belonged to other persons, for which he was paid a certain sum per share for so doing, the amount he is liable upon this deed being 107,550 *l.*; signed the City and Richmond Railway for 150 shares, 7,500 *l.*; signed Gibbs's Brighton for 1,400 *l.*; the South Western for 5,000 *l.*, and is in very reduced circumstances.
2. Ditto - -	ditto - - -	ditto -	110	8,250	
3. Ditto - -	ditto - - -	ditto -	819	61,425	
4. Ditto - -	- -*3, UpperCharles-street,Northampton-square.	ditto -	500	37,500	
1. Henry Cooke -	8, Houndsditch -	ditto -	125	9,375	- - signed the deed for different parties amounting to 16,875 *l.*, and was paid for so doing; signed the Deptford and Dover for 11,500 *l.*; Gibbs's Brighton Railway for 1,200 *l.*, as of Grove-street, Holloway.
2. Ditto - -	ditto - - -	ditto -	82	6,150	
1. William Cooke	- - Keppel-row,Stoke Newington-green.	ditto -	100	7,500	- - this person signed the deeds for parties who paid him amounting to 13,650 *l.*; signed the City and Richmond for 1,000 *l.*; the South Midland Railway for 1,500 *l.*; the London, Shoreham, and Brighton for 600 *l.*
2. Ditto - -	ditto	ditto -	82	6,150	
Benj. Wheeler Poulton.	- -Staines-row,Hounslow.	ditto -	510	38,250	- - signed the Deptford and Dover Railway, and was paid 4 *s.* or 5 *s.* for so doing; signed the Blackwall Railway for 1,000 *l.*; signed Gibbs's Brighton for 3,600 *l.*, and has admitted to your petitioner he was paid by parties for signing the Direct Brighton Railway deed, and is, to the knowledge of your petitioner, very poor.
William Peters -	Minories - -	ditto -	35	2,625	- - signed the South Midland Railway Company for twenty shares, 1,000 *l.*, describing himself of No. 7, Vine street, America-square, gentleman; the Deptford and Dover Railway as of the Minories, his correct description is of No. 7, Vine-street. He is a clerk in a wine merchant's office.
John Haley - -	- - 8, Thomas-street, Mile End.	ditto -	15	1,125	- - signed the South Midland Railway for twenty shares, 1,000 *l.*; the Westminster and Deptford for 1,500 *l.*, for which he was paid 10 *s.*
John Jackson -	14, Dorset-crescent -	ditto -	20	1,500	- - signed the South Midland Company for 370 shares, 15,500 *l.*; the London Grand Junction for 2,000 *l.*; the Westminster and Deptford Railway Company for 500 *l.*, and a second time for 2,500 *l.*, for which last signature he was paid 10 *s.*; the City and Richmond Railway for 5,000 *l.*; and the South Eastern Dover line for 9,750 *l.*
Charles Moring -	- - 7, Ferdinand-terrace,Hampstead-row.	- -	25	1,875	- - signed the South Midland Railway deed for 2,500 *l.*

That the circumstances hereinbefore mentioned did not come to the knowledge of your petitioner until very recently, and after the second reading of the said Bill.

That your petitioner begs to call the attention of your Honourable House to the different Bills which passed last session of Parliament into law, with a view to examine into the difficulties the promoters of railroad undertakings are now labouring under, to procure the capital and other objects contemplated by the Acts of Parliament to be carried into execution, arising, as your petitioner believes, from the want of proper precaution being used, and in allowing improper persons to sign the Parliamentary deeds.

That your petitioner, for obvious reasons, declines stating the names of the undertakings referred to upon the face of this petition.

That your petitioner most respectfully calls the attention of this Honourable House, previous to sanctioning any undertaking requiring large capital, to thoroughly examine into the capabilities of the subscribers performing their contract, as a protection to the real *bonâ fide* shareholders; and also as a security to Parliament and the other parties interested in the completion of the undertaking.

That your petitioner is aware of the benefit likely to accrue by great national undertakings of this description being carried into execution; but your petitioner is also satisfied of the necessity of compelling a strict compliance with the Standing Orders of your Honourable House, so far as regards railway undertakings, in order to insure the respectability of the parties interested therein.

That your petitioner has heard and believes the same to be true, that in many railway undertakings which have received the sanction of the Legislature, deception has been practised in order to comply with the Standing Orders of the Honourable House, and parties have been employed to sign the Parliamentary deeds having no interest whatever in the same.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays that your Honourable House will deem the allegations contained in this petition worthy of being inquired into.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 7.

No. 7.

Petition of Samuel Carr.

PETITION of *Samuel Carr*.—28 April 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Samuel Carr*, of 27, Half-moon-crescent, Pentonville, gentleman,

Sheweth,

That your petitioner has made himself acquainted with the particulars of certain petitions presented to your Honourable House on the 24th day of April instant, signed respectively by Richard Lill, Henry Cooke and Benjamin Wheeler Poulton.

That your petitioner humbly represents to your Honourable House, that he did sign the Parliamentary contract of the Direct London and Brighton Railway for 1,434 shares, and that he so signed the contract for the same at the times and in manner following; that is to say, on the 14th day of November last for five shares, at the banking house of Messrs. Hankey & Co., the bankers of the said company; on the 15th day of November last for 110 shares at the same place; and that your petitioner did, at the said respective times of signing the said contract, pay to the said bankers the sum of 1 *l.* upon each of such shares, and handed over to the said bankers old scrip of the said company for the said five shares and 110 shares; and that your petitioner did, on the 17th day of January last, sign the same contract for 819 shares at the office of the said company, in Chapel-place, Poultry, and on the 18th day of January last signed the said contract at the same place for 500 shares; and did, at the respective times of so signing the said contract, at the office of the said company, pay to the said company the sum of 1 *l.* upon each of such last-mentioned shares, and handed over to the said company old scrip of the said company for the said 819 shares and 500 shares.

That the five shares and 110 shares so signed for by your petitioner, at the bankers of the said company, were upon your petitioner's own account, and that he did not receive from any person or persons whomsoever any remuneration or consideration for signing for the same shares.

That your petitioner was employed by, and as the agent of, Mr. Huckvale, of the Stock Exchange, to sign the said contract for 1,829 shares, and that your petitioner signed the said contract himself as such agent for the said 819 shares and 500 shares, and employed the said Benjamin Wheeler Poulton to sign the said contract for the remaining 510 shares, and that your petitioner received from the said Mr. Huckvale a remuneration for so doing.

That your petitioner begs most unequivocally to represent to your Honourable House, that the several transactions above stated were wholly unknown to the said Direct London and Brighton Railway Company, their solicitor, secretary or agents, or any of them, and that neither the said company, nor their solicitors, secretary or agents, or any of them, were in anywise privy to, or cognizant of, the same.

Your petitioner, therefore, humbly prays your Honourable House, that if he has acted wrong in the matters above stated, he may incur the blame, and that the Bill for the said railway may not be prejudiced thereby, as the whole was done without the knowledge or consent of the said company, their solicitor, secretary or agents, or any of them; and that your Honourable House will not inflict any punishment on your petitioner for having executed the said contract, as he did it without knowing that he was doing wrong, and is ready and willing to account to your Honourable House for having done so.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 8.

No. 8.

Petition of Richard Blackmore.

PETITION of *Richard Blackmore*.—1 May 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Richard Blackmore*, of Trafalgar-place, West, Hackney-road,

Sheweth,

That your petitioner has read the petition of the secretary of Mr. Stephenson's Brighton Railway Company, presented to your Honourable House on the 24th day of April instant, calling in question the subscription list of the Direct London and Brighton Railway Company.

That your petitioner humbly represents to your Honourable House, that on or about the 13th day of December last, he was the *bonâ fide* holder on his own account of ten shares of the said company, upon which 2 *l.* deposit had been paid, and that being such holder, he did, as alleged in the said petition, sign the Parliamentary contract of the said company for the same shares, at the office of the said company, in Chapel-place, Poultry, and that your petitioner did, at the time of so signing the said contract, pay to the said company the sum of 1 *l.* upon each of such shares (being the amount of the call then made thereon), and at the same time exchanged the old scrip of the said company for new scrip.

That your petitioner denies, most distinctly, that he is in very distressed circumstances, or that

that he was paid any consideration for signing the said contract for the said ten shares, as alleged in the said petition.

No. 8.
Petition of Richard Blackmore.

Your petitioner therefore humbly craves leave to lay the above facts before your Honourable House, and humbly prays your Honourable House to act in the premises as to your Honourable House shall seem meet.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 9.

PETITION of *John Haley*.—1 May 1837.

No. 9.
Petition of John Haley.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *John Haley*, of 16, White's-row, Mile End,

Sheweth,

That your petitioner has read the petition of Daniel Edward Stephens, presented to your Honourable House on the 28th day of April last, calling in question the subscription list of the Direct London and Brighton Railway Company.

That your Petitioner humbly represents to your Honourable House, that he did, on or about the 15th day of November last, sign the Parliamentary contract of the said company for fifteen shares in the said company, upon which a deposit of 2 *l.* per share had been paid at the banking house of Messrs. Hankey & Co., the bankers of the said company, and that your petitioner did, at the time of so signing the said contract, pay to the said bankers the sum of 1 *l.* upon each of such shares, being the amount of the call then made thereon.

That your petitioner at the time he so signed the said contract was the *bonâ fide* holder of the said fifteen shares, having purchased the same in the market, and he denies most distinctly that he signed the said contract for any other person, or that he was paid any consideration for signing the same by any person or persons whomsoever.

Your petitioner therefore humbly craves leave to lay the above facts before your Honourable House, and humbly prays your Honourable House to act in the premises as to your Honourable House shall seem meet.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 10.

PETITION of *W. Cooke*.—1 May 1837.

No. 10.
Petition of W. Cooke.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *William Cooke*, of Keppel-row, Stoke Newington-green,

Sheweth,

That your petitioner has read the petition of the secretary of Mr. Stephenson's Brighton Railway Company, presented to your Honourable House on the 24th day of April last, alleging that your petitioner signed the parliamentary contract of the Direct London and Brighton Railway for the sum of 17,400 *l.*

That your petitioner humbly represents to your Honourable House, that he did sign the said Parliamentary contract for 182 shares, amounting to 13,650 *l.*, and not for 17,400 *l.*, as alleged in the said petition, and that upon so signing the said contract he paid to the said company the sum of 182 *l.*, being the amount of the call then made upon each of the said shares, and produced the old scrip for the said shares.

That your petitioner was requested by his son to sign the said deed for the said 182 shares, and received from his said son the said sum of 182 *l.*, wherewith to pay the amount of the said call, and the old scrip for the said 182 shares; but your petitioner received no remuneration from his said son for so doing.

That your petitioner begs most unequivocally to state to your Honourable House, that, in so signing the said contract for his said son, he was not aware he was infringing or acting contrary to any of the rules of your Honourable House, and that the said company, or their bankers, solicitors, secretary, officers or agents, were not aware that he was not the real and *bonâ fide* holder of the said shares when he so signed for them, as he produced the old scrip and paid the amount of the new call, which, as appears to your petitioner, was the best if not the only evidence of ownership that the said company could require or acknowledge.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays your Honourable House, that if he has acted wrong in the matters above stated, he may incur the blame, and that the Bill for the said railway may not be prejudiced thereby in the opinion of your Honourable House, as the said company could not possibly be aware that he was not the owner of the said 182 shares at the time he signed the said deed, as he had the best, if not the only evidence of ownership in his possession at the time he signed the deed; namely, the old scrip, and was not allowed to sign the said deed until he produced the same, and paid the new call.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 11.

No. 11.

Petition of George Walker.

PETITION of *Geo. Walker.*—1 May 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *George Walker*, of Old Change, in the City of London,

Sheweth,

That your petitioner has seen the petition presented to your Honourable House on the 24th day of April instant, by the secretary of Mr. Stephenson's Brighton Railway Company, impugning the validity of the subscription contract of the Direct London and Brighton Railway.

That your petitioner has also seen a petition of Mr. Joseph Thompson, of Old Change, aforesaid, intended to be presented to your Honourable House on this day.

That your petitioner humbly begs to confirm the statements made in such last-mentioned petition, so far as regards your petitioner, and to represent to your Honourable House, that the thirty-five shares for which he executed the parliamentary contract of the said Direct London and Brighton Railway, were the property of the said Joseph Thompson, and that the 35 *l.* paid by your petitioner as the call upon such shares, were the proper monies of the said Joseph Thompson, and that your petitioner in signing the said deed acted under his directions, but received no consideration or remuneration for so doing, and that your petitioner was not aware that by signing the said deed for the said Joseph Thompson he was doing wrong, or infringing any of the rules of your Honourable House; and your petitioner solemnly declares, that neither the said company, nor their bankers, solicitors, secretary, officers or agents, knew that the said thirty-five shares did not belong to your petitioner, as your petitioner took with him to the bankers the old scrip and paid the money, and executed the deed and received the new scrip.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays your Honourable House, that if he acted wrong in the matter above stated, he may incur the blame, and that the Bill for the said Direct London and Brighton Railway may not be prejudiced thereby in the opinion of your Honourable House, as the whole was done without the knowledge or consent of the said company, their bankers, solicitors, secretary, officers or agents, or any of them.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 12.

No. 12.

Petition of Robert Huckvale and Others.

PETITION of *Robert Huckvale and Others.*—1 May 1837.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of *Robert Huckvale, James Witten,* and *Edward Frith,*

Sheweth,

That your petitioners are members of the Stock Exchange, and have been so for a considerable time, during which they have dealt in shares in various railway companies, and that they were dealers in the shares of the Direct London and Brighton Railway Company.

That in or about the month of January last, your petitioners were holders of a large number of shares in the said company, upon each of which a deposit of 2 *l.* per share had been paid.

That notice was given by the said company of a further call of 1 *l.* per share, and in the event of such call not being paid and the Parliamentary deed signed by a certain day such shares would become void.

That notice was also given to the holders of the shares upon which 2 *l.* deposit had been paid, that upon payment of a further call of 1 *l.* per share, and signing the Parliamentary contract, and delivering up the old shares to the company, new shares worth 3 *l.* each would be delivered over to the parties.

That your petitioners were unwilling to sign any deed, or incur any risk, except that of the fluctuation of the market.

That your petitioners, being possessed of the said old scrip, were desirous of exchanging it for new, upon which the said call of 1 *l.* per share was to be paid, and they accordingly entered into an arrangement with Samuel Carr and Henry Cooke, who were at that time members of the Stock Exchange, to the effect that your petitioners should deliver the said old scrip in exchange for new scrip, upon which the said call of 1 *l.* per share was to be paid, and for which your petitioners were willing to pay a premium.

That your petitioners therefore delivered over to the said Samuel Carr and Henry Cooke several hundred old scrip, together with the deposit money required to be paid previous to the new scrip being issued, upon the understanding that new scrip for the like amount was to be delivered over to your petitioners, and that upon such delivery of the new scrip the premium agreed upon was paid.

That your petitioners believe that neither the directors of the said company, nor any of the officers or agents thereof, were aware of the nature of the interest of the said Samuel Carr and Henry Cooke in the said shares for which they signed the deed and paid the said call,

and

No. 12.
Petition of Robert Huckvale and Others.

and that even if they had been, your petitioners believe that they could not have refused to have accepted such persons as holders of such scrip, nor have refused to let them sign the deed pursuant to their advertisement, upon payment of the said call.

That in the above transactions your petitioners did not consider they were doing anything wrong, or infringing any rule of your Honourable House; and that if your petitioners have in any manner in the above transactions acted wrong, or against the rules of your Honourable House, your petitioners exceedingly regret it, and most distinctly declare that the directors of the said company, or their officers or agents, or any of them, in no way participated therein, or, as your petitioners verily believe, were in any manner cognizant thereof.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that this explanation may be satisfactory to your Honourable House.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 13.

PETITION of *Joseph Thompson*.—1 May 1837.

No. 13.
Petition of Joseph Thompson.

TO the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of *Joseph Thompson*, of Old Change, in the City of London, calico printer,

Sheweth,

That your petitioner has seen the petition presented to your Honourable House on the 24th April last, by the secretary of Mr. Stephenson's Brighton Railway Company, impugning the validity of the subscription list of the Direct London and Brighton Railway.

That your petitioner was an original subscriber to the Direct London and Brighton Railway for twenty-five shares, and paid the original deposit thereon of 2 *l.* per share, and retained such shares during the whole of the Parliamentary contest of last session; and that, in addition to his original subscription for twenty-five shares, he purchased in the share market thirty-five other shares in the said company, upon which the 2 *l.* deposit had been paid.

That the said Direct London and Brighton Railway Company having made a further call of 1 *l.* upon each of their shares, your petitioner did, on the 15th day of November last, call at Messrs. Hankey's, in Fenchurch-street, the bankers of the said company, and pay the further call of 1 *l.* on the twenty-five shares he originally held in the said company, and executed the Parliamentary contract for the same shares, and handed over the old scrip in exchange for new scrip.

That your petitioner, on the said 15th day of November last, gave George Walker, who is in his employ, the old scrip for the thirty-five shares so purchased by your petitioner in the market, and the sum of 35 *l.* (being the amount of the further call of 1 *l.* on each of such shares), and desired him to go to the said bankers and deliver up to them the said old scrip and pay the said sum of 35 *l.*, and sign the Parliamentary contract, in his own name, for the said shares, and receive the new scrip; and that the said George Walker acted according to your petitioner's instructions, and brought back to your petitioner new scrip for the said thirty-five shares, but received no consideration or remuneration for so doing.

That your petitioner was induced to instruct the said George Walker to sign the deed for the said thirty-five shares, because he did not wish his own name to appear in the Parliamentary contract for any greater number of shares than the twenty-five he originally held in the said company, and that in so doing your petitioner was not aware that he was acting wrong or infringing any of the rules of your Honourable House; and that if your petitioner has acted wrong or against such rules he exceedingly regrets it, and most distinctly declares that the directors of the said company, or their bankers, solicitors, secretary, officers or agents, or any of them, in no way participated therein, or were in any manner cognizant thereof.

That your petitioner also begs to state to your Honourable House, that he still holds not only the twenty-five shares signed for by him, but also the thirty-five shares signed for by the said George Walker, making together sixty shares, and is ready and willing to substitute his name for the said thirty-five shares so signed for by the said George Walker, in addition to the twenty-five signed for by your petitioner, and to pay the calls that may be made by the said company in respect of the whole of the said sixty shares, or to indemnify the said George Walker for so signing the said deed for thirty-five shares, as your petitioner has ever considered himself the responsible person for the same.

Your petitioner therefore most humbly prays your Honourable House, that if he acted wrong in the matter above stated he may incur the blame, and that the Bill for the said Direct London and Brighton Railway may not be prejudiced thereby in the opinion of your Honourable House, as the whole was done without the knowledge or consent of the said company, their bankers, solicitors, secretary, or officers or agents, or any of them.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 14.

No. 14. Parliamentary Contract.

PARLIAMENTARY CONTRACT.

THIS Indenture, made the 12th day of February 1836, between Sir William Jolliffe, bart., Sir James Fellowes, knight, Matthias Wilks, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, and Benjamin Davis, esqrs., of the first part; John Harman, Captain Richard Heaviside, Colonel Hylton Jolliffe, Thomas Sinclair Robinson, Robert Sutton the younger, Jonathan Thorp, and Joseph Browne Wilks, esqrs., of the second part, and the several other persons whose hands are hereunto subscribed, and seals affixed, of the third part; witnesseth that each of them, the said parties hereto of the first part, doth hereby for himself and his heirs, executors and administrators, and to the extent only of the sum or amount in money set opposite to his name, and not further or otherwise, covenant, promise and agree with and to the said parties hereto of the second part, their executors and administrators; and each of them the said parties hereto of the second part, and also each and every of them the said several persons parties hereto of the third part, doth hereby for himself and herself, and for his and her respective heirs, executors and administrators, and to the extent only of the sum or amount in money set opposite to his and her name, covenant, promise, undertake, declare, and agree with and to the said parties hereto of the first part, in manner following; that is to say, that they, the said several parties hereto of the first, second and third parts, together with the several other persons who have set their names and affixed their seals to two certain deeds or agreements bearing even date herewith, have subscribed and do hereby subscribe the several sums set opposite to their respective names for the purpose of making and establishing a railway to be called or described by the name of "The Direct London and Brighton Railway," or to be named or described by such other name or names as may at any time hereafter be adopted by the directors engaged in promoting the establishment of such railway, the same railway to lead from Croydon to Brighton, with a branch from Brighton to Shoreham, or to lead from Kennington to Brighton, with such branch, if Parliament shall think proper, and the same railway to go by such course, route or line, and through such parishes, townships or places as shall be hereafter from time to time selected and approved of by the directors for the time being engaged in conducting and carrying into effect the said undertaking, together with proper wharfs, locks, basins, quays, warehouses and other works, erections and conveniences thereto respectively appertaining, the same respectively to be made, constructed, established and conducted in such manner as shall be provided for by an Act or Acts of Parliament to be applied for in the present session of Parliament; or in case such Act or Acts shall not be applied for, or if applied for, shall not be obtained in the present session, then such as shall or may be applied for and obtained in any subsequent session of Parliament, in which Act or Acts it is intended to introduce a clause to save harmless the several subscribers and proprietors of shares and their respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns from being liable in any event for any further or other sum than what shall be so respectively subscribed by each of them as aforesaid; and this indenture further witnesseth that they the said several persons, parties hereto, for themselves severally and respectively, and for their several and respective heirs, executors and administrators, do hereby covenant and declare, that they or their respective heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, shall and will well and truly pay or cause to be paid the amount set opposite to their respective names, and subscribed by each of them respectively, when and as the same shall from time to time be called for under and by virtue of the said Act or Acts of Parliament, and within the time or period which shall or may be limited thereby, and not exceeding 10 years from the date hereof; and they the said several persons, parties hereto, for themselves respectively, and for their several and respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, do and each of them doth hereby give and grant unto the directors for the time being engaged in conducting the said undertaking, full power and authority to fix upon and from time to time to alter and vary as well the site or spot at which the said intended railway shall commence, as also the site or spot at which it shall terminate, and the intermediate course, route or line thereof, and also from time to time to determine what branches shall be made therefrom, and to fix upon, and from time to time alter and vary the extent and situation of the wharfs, docks, quays, warehouses and other works, erections and conveniences thereto respectively belonging, and to make or renew applications to Parliament for all or any of such purposes from time to time as they in their discretion shall think proper, and to confine the application or applications to Parliament in the present or any future session to any portion of the main line, omitting all or any of the branches, and deferring the application of the remainder of such main line, or any part or parts thereof, and for all or any of the branches to a future session or sessions; and lastly, they the said several persons, parties hereto respectively, do hereby severally for themselves, and for their several and respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, undertake and agree that in the event of such Act or Acts of Parliament not being passed into a law, that each of them severally and respectively shall and will well and truly bear, pay, allow and discharge out of and from the deposits paid and advanced by the subscribers to the said undertaking, the expenses already incurred, or hereafter to be incurred, attending the surveys and estimates for the said railway, branches and works, solicitors' and counsels' fees and charges, travelling expenses, and all other costs and charges of every description incident to the proposed undertaking, and to the application or applications to Parliament, such expenses, costs and charges to be computed and assessed rateably upon the amount of the shares or sums subscribed

No. 14. Parliamentary Contract.

subscribed by each of the said several persons, parties to these presents; and it is hereby declared, that the several persons who have subscribed their names and affixed their seals to two other deeds or agreements of the same tenor or date as these presents, shall be and be deemed as parties hereto, in like manner as if the whole of the persons who have signed and sealed the said other deeds and agreements had signed and sealed these presents; and the said two deeds or agreements, and this deed or agreement, shall be deemed and construed to be one deed and agreement only. In witness whereof the said parties to these presents have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

Appendix, No. 15.

SUBSCRIBERS' AGREEMENT.

No. 15. Subscribers' Agreement.

12 February 1836.

1. We, the several persons whose names and seals are subscribed and affixed, do hereby declare that we have become and are subscribers for the several shares and sums of money set opposite to our respective names, to accomplish an undertaking for the making and constructing a railway to be called and described as "The Direct London and Brighton Railway," with a branch from Brighton to Shoreham, or to be called and described by such other name or names, description or descriptions, as may be resolved upon and adopted at any time hereafter by the directors for the time being engaged in promoting such undertaking.

2. And we do hereby recognise and acknowledge the following persons to be the present directors; namely, Sir Wm. Jolliffe, bart., Sir James Fellowes, knight, Matthias Wilks, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, Benjamin Davis, John Harman, Captain Richard Heaviside, Colonel Hylton Jolliffe, Thomas Sinclair Robinson, Robert Sutton the younger, Jonathan Thorp and Joseph Browne Wilks; and we also recognise and acknowledge the said Matthias Wilks, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, John Harman, Robert Sutton the younger, and Jonathan Thorp, to be the present trustees of the said undertaking; and we also recognise and acknowledge the said Sir William Jolliffe, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, John Harman, Robert Sutton the younger, Jonathan Thorp, Matthias Wilks and Joseph Browne Wilks, together with the Right Honourable the Earl Somers, the Right Honourable Lord Monson, the Right Honourable Lord Eastnor, Sir Keith Jackson, bart., Grant Allan the younger, Edward Hill Creasy, Archibald Little and Thomas Neale, to have been a provisional committee for the purpose of promoting the said undertaking.

3. And moreover, we do hereby, in furtherance of the said measure, and in addition to a certain deed or Parliamentary contract and engagement bearing even date herewith, under our respective hands and seals, severally and respectively, and for our several and respective heirs, executors and administrators, covenant, promise and agree to and with the said Sir William Jolliffe, bart., Sir James Fellowes, knight, Matthias Wilks, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, Benjamin Davis, John Harman, Captain Richard Heaviside, Colonel Hylton Jolliffe, Thomas Sinclair Robinson, Robert Sutton the younger, Jonathan Thorp and Joseph Browne Wilks, and each and every of them, that we severally, and our several and respective executors and administrators, shall and will faithfully conform to and abide by the several stipulations, rules and regulations hereinafter next mentioned and set forth, until an Act or Acts of Parliament shall be obtained; viz.:

4. That the said directors, or any board or meeting thereof, constituted according to the provisions herein contained, shall have full and ample power to carry the said undertaking into effect, or such parts thereof as they may think advisable, and for that purpose to confirm all such measures as have been adopted by the provisional committee of the said undertaking for the carrying the said undertaking into effect, and to pursue all such other measures as the board of directors may in their judgment consider or be advised as necessary or expedient for obtaining an Act or Acts of Parliament in the present or any succeeding session of Parliament, for the establishment of the said undertaking.

5. That the majority of members at any meeting of a board of directors (such meeting consisting of not less than three members) shall bind all the members, whether present or absent; and the chairman or other member presiding at any meeting of a board of directors, shall, in addition to his vote as a director, have a casting vote.

6. That the said board of directors shall have power from time to time to add to its number from among the subscribers to the undertaking holding each 20 shares at the least, to supply any vacancies that may occur in the board, and also to appoint committees of management in London, Brighton, Reigate, Croydon, or elsewhere, delegating to such committees of management such duties and powers, and to be exercised under such circumstances and for such period of time as the said directors may from time to time think proper.

7. That inasmuch as another undertaking has been projected for constructing a railway to Brighton by way of Dorking, Horsham and Shoreham, which is generally termed Mr. Stephenson's line, and as such last-mentioned undertaking would, if established and carried into effect, not be so beneficial to the public as the undertaking which is the subject of this agreement, we hereby empower the directors to take such measures as they shall think fit, either in their or any of their own names, or in the names of or jointly with any other person or persons, for the purpose of preventing the said last-mentioned undertaking from being established by Parliament or otherwise.

8. That the said directors shall have full power to appoint, suspend or remove and re-appoint

No. 15. Subscribers' Agreement.

re-appoint bankers, solicitors, engineers, secretary, surveyors, clerks, agents, servants and workmen, and other officers.

9. That the said directors shall have full power to pay and allow out of the deposits hereinafter provided to be paid, all costs, charges and expenses which have been incurred, and which shall be incurred for surveys, plans and estimates, and otherwise, for the purpose of authorizing an application to Parliament, and for obtaining or endeavouring to obtain an Act or Acts of Parliament for establishing the said undertaking, and for preventing or endeavouring to prevent any Act from passing for establishing Mr. Stephenson's line of railway, and also all salaries, recompences and engagements which the provisional committee or directors may have engaged or shall engage or be liable to pay in the management of the said undertaking, and of all measures connected therewith, or with the said Mr. Stephenson's line.

10. That the directors shall have full power to make and enter into all such contracts and agreements with landowners and all other persons as they shall think right and proper to enter into touching and concerning the said undertaking, and all other matters incident to the application for and soliciting the proposed Act or Acts of Parliament, and to the said undertaking, and to the carrying the same into effect.

11. That the directors shall have full power from time to time to make and establish all such bye-laws as they may think necessary or expedient for the good government of themselves and the committees which may be appointed by them.

12. That 800,000 *l.* shall be the capital of the said undertaking, but in case the directors shall be of opinion that the said railway should commence at Kennington, or any other place between Croydon and London, then the directors are at liberty to increase the capital to such an amount as they shall think necessary, such increased capital to be subscribed in like manner as the 800,000 *l.*

13. That a deposit of 2 *l.* per share shall be paid by each subscriber at the time of his executing this agreement, but that no further deposit or sum shall be called for on account of expenses or otherwise, until the proposed Act or Acts of Parliament shall be obtained, unless at any general meeting of the subscribers, to be called by advertisement, the majority of the subscribers present at such meeting (such majority to be determined by the number of shares represented by the subscribers present) shall direct and require that a further deposit upon each share shall be paid, (to be applicable in like manner as the 2 *l.* per share deposit,) in which case each and every subscriber hereby agrees to pay such further sum per share as shall be resolved upon, directed and required at such general meeting to be paid.

Lastly, that the several persons who have subscribed their names and affixed their seals to two other deeds or agreements of the same tenor and date as these presents shall be and be deemed as parties hereto, in like manner as if the whole of the persons who have signed and sealed the said other deeds and agreements had signed and sealed these presents; and the said two deeds or agreements, and this deed or agreement, shall be construed to be one deed or agreement only.

Appendix, No. 16.

No. 16. Parliamentary Contract without the Signatures.

PARLIAMENTARY CONTRACT WITHOUT THE SIGNATURES.

THIS indenture, made the 4th day of November, in the year 1836, between Sir William George Hylton Jolliffe, bart., Matthias Wilks, Charles Sedgfield Crowley and Benjamin Davis, esqrs., of the first part; John Harman, Captain Richard Heaviside, Thomas Sinclair Robinson, Robert Sutton the younger, and Joseph Browne Wilks, esqrs., of the second part, and the several other persons whose hands are hereunto subscribed and seals affixed of the third part; witnesseth that each of them, the said parties hereto of the first part, doth hereby for himself, his heirs, executors and administrators, and to the extent only of the sum or amount in money set opposite to his name in the seventh column of the schedule hereunder written, headed "Amount of Subscription," and not further or otherwise, covenant, promise, and agree with and to the said parties hereto of the second part, their executors and administrators; and each of them the said parties hereto of the second part, and also each and every of them the said several persons, parties hereto of the third part, doth hereby for himself and herself, and for his and her respective heirs, executors and administrators, and to the extent only of the sum or amount in money set opposite to his and her name in the said seventh column mentioned, covenant, promise, undertake, declare and agree with and to the said parties hereto of the first part, in manner following; that is to say, that they the said several parties hereto of the first, second and third parts, together with the several other persons who have set their names and affixed their seals to two other certain deeds or agreements bearing even date herewith, have subscribed and do hereby subscribe the several sums set opposite to their respective names in the said seventh column mentioned, for the purpose of making and establishing a railway with branches, to be called or described by the name of "The Direct London and Brighton Railway," or by such other name or names as may at any time hereafter be adopted by the directors engaged in promoting the establishment of such railway and branches, the same railway to lead from and out of the Croydon Railway, at a part or place within or near the parish of Croydon in the county of Surrey, to Brighton in the county of Sussex, with branches to Shoreham, Lewes and Newhaven in the said county of Sussex, and to Reigate in the said county of Surrey, and the same railway

and

No. 16. Parliamentary Contract without the Signatures.

and branches respectively to go by such course, route or line, and through such parishes, towns, townships, hamlets and extra parochial places as shall be hereafter from time to time selected and approved of by the directors for the time being engaged in conducting and carrying into effect the said undertaking, together with proper stations, wharfs, quays, warehouses, and other works, erections and conveniences thereto respectively appertaining, the same respectively to be made, constructed, established and conducted in such manner as shall be provided for by an Act or Acts of Parliament to be applied for in the ensuing session of Parliament, or in case such Act or Acts shall not be applied for, or if applied for, shall not be obtained in the ensuing session, then such as shall or may be applied for and obtained in any subsequent session of Parliament. And this indenture further witnesseth, that the said several persons, parties hereto, for themselves severally and respectively, and for their several and respective heirs, executors and administrators, do hereby covenant and declare, that they or their respective heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, shall and will well and truly pay or cause to be paid the amount set opposite to their respective names in the said seventh column in the said schedule mentioned, as and when the same shall from time to time be called for under and by virtue of the said Act or Acts of Parliament, and within the time or period which shall or may be limited thereby, and not exceeding ten years from the date thereof. And it is hereby declared, that the several persons who have subscribed their names and affixed their seals to two other deeds or agreements of the same tenor and date as these presents, shall be and be deemed as parties hereto, in like manner as if the whole of the persons who have signed and sealed the said two other deeds and agreements had signed and sealed these presents; and the said two other deeds or agreements, and this deed or agreement, shall be deemed and construed to be one deed and agreement only. In witness whereof the said parties to these presents have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

Appendix, No. 17.

SUBSCRIBERS' AGREEMENT WITHOUT THE SIGNATURES.

No. 17. Subscribers' Agreement without the Signatures.

To all to whom these presents shall come, we whose names are hereunto subscribed and seals affixed send greeting. Whereas in or about the month of February last a company * was formed for the purpose of making and establishing a direct line of railway between London and Brighton, with a branch from Brighton to Shoreham, by the name or style of "The Direct London and Brighton Railway Company;" and whereas the usual deed or subscribers' agreement was entered into by the several persons who were willing to become subscribers to the said undertaking, whereby among other things it was agreed, that the directors therein named should have full power to pursue such measures as might be necessary for obtaining an Act or Acts of Parliament in the then present or any succeeding session for the establishment of the said undertaking, and for opposing a certain line of railway called Mr. Stephenson's Line; and it was also agreed that the capital of the said undertaking should be 800,000 *l.*, with power to increase the same to such an amount as the directors should think fit, upon certain events therein mentioned; and it was also agreed that a deposit of 2 *l.* a share should be paid by each subscriber at the time of his executing such agreement, but that no further deposit should be called for until the proposed Act or Acts should be obtained, unless at a general meeting of the subscribers, to be called by advertisement, the majority or value of the subscribers then present should direct and require a further deposit to be paid, in which case each and every subscriber thereby agreed to pay such further sum per share as should be resolved upon, directed or required at such general meeting; and whereas the usual deed or Parliamentary contract was at the same time entered into by the said several persons parties to the before-mentioned deed or agreement, whereby, amongst other things, it was agreed by the said several persons, parties hereto, to subscribe the amounts set opposite to their respective names, for the purpose of making a railway to be called by the name of "The Direct London and Brighton Railway," or by such other name or names as the directors for the time being should adopt, and to lead from Croydon to Brighton, with a branch from Brighton to Shoreham, with such other erections and conveniences as should be necessary and should be provided for by an Act or Acts of Parliament to be applied for in the then present session, and in case such Act or Acts should not be obtained in the present session, then such as should be applied for in any subsequent session of Parliament; and in the said deed or agreement is contained a clause, authorizing the directors for the time being to alter and vary as well the sites and spots at which the said railway should commence and terminate, as the intermediate course, route or line thereof, and also to determine what branches should be made therefrom, and to fix upon, alter and determine from time to time the erections and conveniences thereon and thereto, and to make or renew applications to Parliament for all or any of the purposes aforesaid, from time to time, as they should think proper; and whereas, in pursuance of such contract and agreement, application was made to Parliament for an Act to construct such railway, but without success, and it has therefore become necessary to renew such application in the ensuing session; and whereas, in further pursuance of such contract and agreement, a general meeting of the subscribers was called by public advertisement, which meeting was held on the 18th day of October last, when amongst other things it was unanimously resolved, that the directors should renew the application to Parliament in the ensuing session for obtaining an Act for a Direct Line of Railway to Brighton, with Branches to Shoreham, Lewes, Newhaven and Reigate, and should take all

* First Company.

No. 17.
Subscribers' Agreement without the Signatures.

such means in relation thereto as they should think proper, and that the capital of the company should be increased to 1,200,000 *l.*, by converting every 50 *l.* share into a 75 *l.* share, and that a call for 2 *l.* should be, and the same was thereby made upon each share, to be paid at such time or times as the directors might appoint; and whereas the directors have accordingly required the sum of 1 *l.* to be now paid on each 75 *l.* share, (being a moiety of the said 2 *l.* call), which, with the sum of 2 *l.* heretofore paid on every 50 *l.* share, will make the sum now paid on each 75 *l.* share amount to 3 *l.* And whereas the directors will require the payment of the remaining 1 *l.* per share at some future period. Now, know ye, that we do hereby declare, that we have become and are subscribers for the several shares and sums of money set opposite to our respective names in the sixth and seventh columns in the schedule hereunder written, under the head "Number of Shares" and "Amount of Subscription," to accomplish an undertaking for the making and constructing a railway with branches, to be called and described by the name of "The Direct London and Brighton Railway," or by such other name or names, description or descriptions as may be resolved on and adopted at any time hereafter by the directors for the time being engaged in promoting such undertaking, the same railway to lead from and out of the Croydon Railway at a part or place within or near the parish of Croydon in the county of Surrey, to Brighton in the county of Sussex, with Branches to Shoreham, Lewes and Newhaven in the said county of Sussex, and to Reigate in the said county of Surrey.

2. And we do hereby recognise and acknowledge the following persons to be the present directors of the said undertaking; namely, Sir William George Hylton Jolliffe, bart., Matthias Wilks, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, Benjamin Davis, John Harman, Captain Richard Heaviside, Thomas Sinclair Robinson, Robert Sutton the younger, and Joseph Browne Wilks, esquires; and we also recognise and acknowledge that the said present directors, together with Sir James Fellowes, knight, Colonel Hylton Jolliffe and Jonathan Thorp, were the first directors of the said undertaking.

2. And we also recognise and acknowledge the said Matthias Wilks, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, John Harman, Robert Sutton the younger, and Joseph Browne Wilks, to be the present trustees of the said undertaking; and we also recognise and acknowledge the said Sir William George Hylton Jolliffe, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, John Harman, Robert Sutton the younger, Jonathan Thorp, Matthias Wilks and Joseph Browne Wilks, together with the Right Honourable the Earl Somers, the Right Honourable Lord Monson, the Right Honourable Lord Eastnor, Sir Keith Jackson, bart., Grant Allan the younger, Edward Hill Creasy, Archibald Little and Thomas Neale, to have been a provisional committee for the purpose of promoting the said undertaking.

3. And moreover, we do hereby, in furtherance of the said measure, and in addition to a certain deed or Parliamentary contract and engagement bearing even date herewith, under our respective hands and seals, severally and respectively, and for our several and respective heirs, executors and administrators, covenant, promise and agree to and with the said Sir William Hylton Jolliffe, bart., Matthias Wilks, Charles Sedgfield Crowley, Benjamin Davis, John Harman, Captain Richard Heaviside, Thomas Sinclair Robinson, Robert Sutton the younger, and Joseph Browne Wilks, and each and every of them, that we severally, and our several and respective executors and administrators, shall and will faithfully conform to and abide by the several stipulations, rules and regulations hereinafter mentioned and set forth, until an Act or Acts of Parliament shall be obtained; viz.

4. That the said present directors, and other the directors for the time being of the said undertaking or any board or meeting thereof, constituted according to the provisions herein contained, shall have full and ample power, and may use their utmost exertions, to carry the said undertaking into effect, or such parts thereof as they may think advisable; and for that purpose to confirm all such measures as have been adopted by the provisional committee and the directors for the time being of the said undertaking, touching or concerning the said undertaking, and to pursue all such other measures as the board of directors may in their judgment consider or be advised as necessary or expedient for obtaining an Act or Acts of Parliament in the ensuing or any subsequent session of Parliament for the establishment of the said undertaking, or any part or parts thereof.

5. That the said present directors, and other the directors for the time being of the said undertaking, shall have full power and authority to fix upon and from time to time to alter and vary as well the site or spot at which the said intended railway and branches respectively shall commence, as also the site or spot at which they shall terminate, and the intermediate course, route or line thereof, and of every of them, and also from time to time to determine what branches shall be made therefrom, either in lieu of or in addition to those hereinbefore mentioned, and to fix upon and from time to time to alter and vary the extent and situation of the stations, wharfs, quays, warehouses and other works, erections and conveniences thereto respectively belonging, and to make or renew application to Parliament in the ensuing or any future session for all or any of such purposes, from time to time, as they in their discretion shall think proper, and to confine the application or applications to Parliament in the ensuing or any future session to any portion of the main line, omitting all or any branches, and deferring the application for the remainder of such main line, or any part or parts thereof, and for all or any branches, to a future session or sessions.

6. That the majority of members at any meeting of a board of directors (such meeting consisting of not less than three members) shall bind all the members, whether present or absent; and the chairman or other member presiding at any meeting of a board of directors shall, in addition to his vote as a director, have a casting vote.

7. That the said board of directors shall have power from time to time to add to its number from among the subscribers to the undertaking, holding each 20 shares at least, and

No. 17.
Subscribers' Agreement without the Signatures.

and to supply any vacancy that may occur in the board, and also to appoint from time to time, or at any time, any new or additional trustee or trustees, and any committees of management, in London, Brighton, Shoreham, Lewes, Newhaven, Reigate, Croydon or elsewhere, delegating to such committees of management such duties and powers, and to be exercised under such circumstances, and for such period of time as the said directors may from time to time think proper.

8. That inasmuch as other undertakings have been projected for constructing a railway to Brighton, with various branches, we hereby empower the said directors to take such measures as they shall think fit, either in their or any of their own names, or in the names of or jointly with any other person or persons, for the purpose of preventing any other or any part of any other railway or railways to Brighton, or any branch railway or railways, from being established by Parliament or otherwise.

9. That the said directors shall have full power to appoint, suspend or remove, and reappoint bankers, solicitors, engineers, secretary, surveyors, clerks, agents, servants and workmen, and other officers.

10. That the said directors shall have full power to pay and allow out of the deposit already paid and to be paid, all costs, charges and expenses which have already or at any time heretofore been incurred, and which shall be hereafter incurred, touching and concerning the surveys, plans, maps, estimates and books of reference, and otherwise, already made and to be made, in relation to the proceedings already had and to be taken for the purpose of authorizing an application to Parliament, and for obtaining or endeavouring to obtain an Act or Acts of Parliament, for establishing the line of railway called "The Direct London and Brighton Railway," with the proposed branches therefrom or any of them, and for preventing or endeavouring to prevent the passing of any Bill for establishing any other or any part of any other line of railway or railways to Brighton, or any branch railway or railways; and also all fees, charges and disbursements, salaries, recompences and engagements, which the said provisional committee or the directors for the time being may have engaged or shall engage or be liable to pay in the management of the said undertaking, and of all measures connected therewith, or with any other or any part of any other railway or railways, or any branch railway or railways.

11. That the directors shall have full power to make and enter into all such contracts and agreements with landowners and all other persons as they shall think right and proper to enter into, touching and concerning the said undertaking, and all other matters incident to the application for and soliciting the proposed Act or Acts of Parliament, and to the said undertaking, and to the carrying the same or any part thereof into effect.

12. That the directors shall have full power from time to time to make and establish all such bye-laws as they may think necessary or expedient, for the good government of themselves and the committees which may be appointed by them.

13. That 1,200,000 *l.* shall be the capital of the said undertaking; but in case the directors shall be of opinion that the same should be increased for the purpose of making any other branches in addition to those before mentioned, or for any other purpose whatsoever, which they shall deem advisable for the purpose of promoting the ultimate success of the undertaking, then the said directors are hereby empowered to increase the capital to such an amount as they shall think necessary, such increase of capital to be subscribed for in such manner as the directors shall deem advisable.

14. That each 50 *l.* share shall be converted into a 75 *l.* share, upon which, in addition to the deposit of 2 *l.* heretofore paid on each 50 *l.* share, a further deposit of 2 *l.* shall be paid on each 75 *l.* share, in manner following; that is to say, 1 *l.* per share, being a moiety thereof, upon our executing these presents, and the remaining 1 *l.* per share at such time as the directors shall appoint for that purpose, but that no further deposit or sum over or above the said last-mentioned 2 *l.* per share shall be called for, on account of expenses or otherwise, until the proposed Act or Acts of Parliament shall be obtained, unless at any general meeting of the subscribers, to be called by advertisement, the majority of the subscribers present (such majority to be determined by the number of shares represented by the subscribers present) shall direct and require that a future deposit on each share shall be paid (to be applicable in like manner as the 2 *l.* per share deposit), in which case each and every subscriber hereby agrees to pay such further sum per share as shall be resolved upon, directed and required at such general meeting to be paid.

Lastly, that the several persons who have subscribed their hands and affixed their seals to two other deeds or agreements of the same tenor and date as these presents, shall be and be deemed as parties hereto, in like manner as if the whole of the persons who have signed and sealed the said two other deeds and agreements had signed and sealed these presents; and the said two other deeds or agreements, and this deed or agreement, shall be construed to be one deed or agreement only.

No. 18.
Subscription List for Session 1836.

Appendix, No. 18.

SUBSCRIPTION LIST FOR SESSION 1836.

Christian and Surname of Subscribers.	Subscribers' Place of Abode.	Subscribers' Quality or Calling.	No. of Shares.	Sums subscribed by each Subscriber.	Deposit paid.
				£.	£.
William Rickford	Aylesbury	banker & M.P.	50	2,500	100
Lewis Burnand, jun.	Stoke Newington	stockbroker	10	500	20
James Sutton	St. John's-wood-road	ditto	100	5,000	200
William Cory	Commercial-rd.Lambeth	coal merchant	20	1,000	40
Henry Francis Richardson	Ironmonger-lane	solicitor	50	2,500	100
Robert Barnett	Birchin-lane	gentleman	50	2,500	100
William Castell Damant	Kensington	ditto	20	1,000	40
Thomas Lund	57, Cornhill	cutler, &c.	25	1,250	50
Jonathan Clark	Camden Town	gentleman	10	500	20
Henry Wade	7, Ironmonger-lane	ditto	10	500	20
John Robson	7, Hamilton-pl.,New-rd.	stockbroker	50	2,500	100
William Enim Northover and John Jones.	Stock Exchange	ditto	40	2,000	80
Thomas Gribble	Stock Exchange	ditto	50	2,500	100
John Carrick	Basinghall-street	esquire	80	4,000	160
Thomas Manning	Stock Exchange	gentleman	50	2,500	100
James White Humphrey	37, Old Jewry	ditto	5	250	10
James Block	Stock Exchange	ditto	25	1,250	50
Thomas Carter	32, Gordon-street, Gordon-square.	ditto	30	1,500	60
Richard Thomas Corbould	9, Bankside, Southw.	ditto	15	750	30
Francis Burnand	24, Change-alley	stockbroker	10	500	20
Edward Goldsmid	41, Upper Harley-st.	esquire	20	1,000	40
John Barnes	Stock Exchange	gentleman	50	2,500	100
Benjamin Bacon Williams	Stock Exchange	ditto	80	4,000	160
James Perry	Stock Exchange	ditto	30	1,500	60
Peter Mallard	Stock Exchange	ditto	10	500	20
George Loveless	Stock Exchange	ditto	15	750	30
Charles Lawrence, jun.	23, Threadneedle-st.	ditto	20	1,000	40
George Ellis	4, King William-st., London-bridge.	ditto	10	500	20
Edmond Thomas Waters	Stock Exchange	ditto	15	750	30
William Hilton Price	Kingsland-place	ditto	10	500	20
John Dubourg	63, Haymarket	hotel-keeper	20	1,000	40
Walter Upton, for self and partners.	64, Queen-street, Cheapside.	colourmen	10	500	20
Wm.George Hylton Jolliffe	Merstham, Surrey	baronet	20	1,000	40
Thomas Scott, jun.	80, Broad-street	billbroker	20	1,000	40
Francis William Medley	80, Broad-street	stockbroker	25	1,250	50
Matthias Wilks	Broome-park, Surrey	esquire	200	10,000	400
Chas. Sedgfield Crowley	Croydon	gentleman	200	10,000	400
Joseph Young	Stock Exchange	ditto	30	1,500	60
John Williams	Stock Exchange	ditto	100	5,000	200
Alexander Young	Stock Exchange	stockbroker	15	750	30
John Beaton	2, Regent-place, Regent-square.	gentleman	10	500	20
Robert Sutton, jun.	Stock Exchange	esquire	200	10,000	400
Manoel Joaquim Soares	36, Crutched-friars	merchant	150	7,500	300
George Robinson	29½, Throgmorton-st.	hatter	10	500	20
Henry Kingscote	Bank-buildings	banker	100	5,000	200
For F. Ladbroke, H. Kingscote.	Bank-buildings	ditto	50	2,500	100
Joseph Browne Wilks	Brighton	esquire	200	10,000	400
William Henry Oxley	Stock Exchange	gentleman	5	250	10
Joseph Thompson	7, Old Change	calico-printer	25	1,250	50
Edward Owen	St.Leonard's Parsonage, Wendover, Bucks.	clerk	200	10,000	400
Robert Maurer	9, South-st., Finsbury	merchant	25	1,250	50
George Carroll	Stock Exchange	gentleman	50	2,500	100
Solomon Jacob Waley	Stock Exchange	ditto	50	2,500	100
James Swaby	Thorne, Great Berkhampstead.	ditto	200	10,000	400
William Alers Hankey	Fenchurch-street	banker	25	1,250	50
Thomas Hankey	Fenchurch-street	ditto	35	1,750	70
Thomas Alers Hankey	Fenchurch-street	ditto	20	1,000	40

No. 18.
Subscription List for Session 1836.

Christian and Surname of Subscribers.	Subscribers' Places of Abode.	Subscribers' Quality or Calling.	No. of Shares.	Sums subscribed by each Subscriber.	Deposit paid.
				£.	£.
Samuel Farmer, by William Meeke Farmer.	Nonsuch-park, Caddington, Epsom, Surrey.	esquire -	25	1,250	50
William Read - -	Gocian-lodge, Down, Ireland; Junior United Service Club.	captain -	50	2,500	100
William Hall - -	83, London-rd. Southwark.	gentleman -	40	2,000	80
John Kirkland - -	80, Pall-mall - -	ditto -	10	500	20
James Crofts - -	4, Frederick's-place -	merchant -	10	500	20
John Alers Hankey -	Fenchurch-street -	banker -	20	1,000	40
John William Liddiard -	Friday-street - -	warehouseman	30	1,500	60
John Pitman - - -	7, Castle-alley, Cornhill	gentleman -	10	500	20
John Walter Upward -	Stock Exchange -	stockbroker	30	1,500	60
John Brothers - -	82, Cornhill - -	lieut. R.N. -	50	2,500	100
John Neale - - -	7, Castle-alley - -	gentleman -	10	500	20
Robert Walter Carden -	11, Throgmorton-st.	stockbroker	60	3,000	120
Thomas Lyon - -	2, Birchin-lane -	ditto -	10	500	20
William Forster - -	King-street, Cheapside	warehouseman	40	2,000	80
Jonathan Thorp - -	30, King-street, ditto	merchant -	200	10,000	400
Daniel Britten - -	27, Cateaton-street -	ditto -	25	1,250	50
Richard Barrett - -	27, Northampton-sq.	founder -	100	5,000	200
John Getting - -	46, Lime-street -	wine mercht.	20	1,000	40
Lancelot Middleton -	46, Lime-street -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
William Herbert Mullins	45, Lothbury - -	broker -	15	750	30
Ericus Robinson - -	15, Hill-st., Finsbury	packer -	20	1,000	40
Frederick Pitman - -	20, Birchin-lane -	gentleman -	10	500	20
Henry Down - -	16, Finch-lane - -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
William Woods - -	King-st., Cheapside -	warehouseman	50	2,500	100
Frederick Thomas West	Commercial-rd., Lamb.	coal merchant	10	500	20
John M'Kenzie Ross -	15, Seymour-pl., New-road.	gentleman -	15	750	30
John Pullen - - -	5, Serjeant's-inn -	solicitor -	10	500	20
Daniel Higley Richardson	Ironmonger-lane -	gentleman -	50	2,500	100
Richard Barnes Barnes -	16, Throgmorton-st. -	ditto -	80	4,000	160
Johnson Stubbs - -	Sutton, Surrey -	ditto -	30	1,500	60
Richard Price - -	Duke-st., Westminster	esquire -	100	5,000	200
Mary Ann Price - -	Duke-st., Westminster	spinster -	10	500	20
John Waller - - -	20, Tavistock-square	gentleman -	15	750	30
Samuel Blaxland - -	12, Devonshire-square	wine mercht.	10	500	20
Henry Upward - -	2, Great St. Helen's -	merchant -	50	2,500	100
Thomas Duck Hopper -	29, Colet-place, Commercial-road.	gentleman -	10	500	20
William Cook - -	41, Myddleton-square	ditto -	15	750	30
Robert Henry Manning -	Stock Exchange -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
George Edmonds - -	27, Bush-lane - -	merchant -	10	500	20
Henry Edmonds - -	27, Bush-lane - -	ditto -	5	250	10
John Kreiger - -	46, Lame-street -	ditto -	25	1,250	50
Joseph Dowson - -	Commercial-rd., Lamb.	ditto -	100	5,000	200
Thomas Tringham Smith	2, Copthall-court -	gentleman -	20	1,000	40
Samuel Richard Getting	46, Lime-street -	ditto -	15	750	30
Thomas Dann - -	Reigate - - -	grocer -	20	1,000	40
Simeon John Boileau -	16, Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane.	esquire -	100	5,000	200
John James Ronaldson -	New Broad-street -	merchant -	200	10,000	400
Jonathan Thorp - -	30, King-st., Cheapside	ditto -	50	2,500	100
Edward Lloyd Morgan -	Stock Exchange -	gentleman -	10	500	20
Henry Hanmer - -	7, Devonshire-place -	M. P. - -	20	1,000	40
Benjamin Bacon Williams	Stock Exchange -	gentleman -	360	18,000	720
Benjamin Godfrey Windus	Tottenham-green -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
John Eccles - - -	4, Bread-street -	merchant -	25	1,250	50
James York - - -	5, Windsor-terrace, Maida-hill.	M. D. - -	10	500	20
John Henry Pollock -	8, Basinghall-street -	solicitor -	10	500	20
George Scheiffell - -	6, Warnford-court -	gentleman -	50	2,500	100
Edward Henry Keeling -	72, Tower-street -	merchant -	25	1,250	50
John William Bell -	Great Ormond-street	ditto -	10	500	20
William Pace - -	Lambeth - -	clerk - -	20	1,000	40

(continued)

No. 18.
Subscription List for Session 1836.

Christian and Surname of Subscribers.	Subscribers' Places of Abode.	Subscribers' Quality or Calling.	No. of Shares.	Sums subscribed by each Subscriber.	Deposit paid.
				£.	£.
Edward C. Faithfull -	5, King's-road, Bedford-row.	solicitor -	5	250	10
Frederick Lokes Slous -	Stock Exchange -	gentleman -	20	1,000	40
Henry Richard Mark -	Stock Exchange -	ditto -	25	1,250	50
Hopper Banks - -	31, Colet-place, Commercial-road.	ditto -	10	500	20
Herbert Wyatt - -	Junior United Service Club.	ditto -	10	500	20
Albert Barrett - -	Winterslow - place North, Brixton.	ditto -	30	1,500	60
Thomas William Meller	Denmark-hill - -	ditto -	5	250	10
Matthew Boulton Rennie	6, Whitehall - -	ditto -	100	5,000	200
Henry Robert Rogers -	10, Bartholomew-place, Kentish-town.	ditto -	5	250	10
Charles Andrew Amber -	5, Hanover-street, Hanover-square.	ditto -	10	500	20
John Eykyn - - -	22, Change-alley -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
Joseph Starling - -	Stock Exchange -	ditto -	5	250	10
Stephen Nicolson Barber	Cowper's-ct., Cornhill	broker -	75	3,750	150
Edward Thos. Bainbridge	Park-place - -	gentleman -	80	4,000	160
Nathaniel Hollingsworth	24, Cateaton-street -	solicitor -	10	500	20
John Edward Pember -	Stock Exchange -	gentleman -	10	500	20
William Aitkin Brown -	23, Park-street, Southwark.	brewer -	15	750	30
Stephen Alers Hankey -	25, Crutched-friars -	merchant -	30	1,500	60
John Curtis - - -	11, Basinghall-street	solicitor -	10	500	20
John Twells - - -	27, Gracechurch-st. -	banker -	50	2,500	100
Hutton Littlewood -	Thornton-heath, Surrey	gentleman -	25	1,250	50
G. Lewis Hollingsworth -	Clapham Common -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
William Tite - -	1, St. Helen's-place -	architect -	20	1,000	40
Thomas Head - -	Croydon - - -	merchant -	10	500	20
William Charles Levin -	Camberwell - -	ditto -	5	250	10
François Louis Baud -	Weston-hill, Norwood	gentleman -	20	1,000	40
John Robertson - -	Great George-street, Westminster.	merchant -	465	23,250	930
Albert Francis Favey -	Thornton-heath, near Croydon.	gentleman -	50	2,500	100
Benjamin Hawes - -	80, Old Broad-street	merchant -	20	1,000	40
Thomas Turner - -	14, South-sq., Gray's-inn.	gentleman -	25	1,250	50
George Mausse - -	Subscription - room, Lloyd's.	insurance-broker.	10	500	20
Thomas Neale - -	Reigate, Surrey -	gentleman -	100	5,000	200
John M'Keller - -	2, Judd-place, East -	ditto -	10	500	20
Joseph Kendall - -	13, St. George's-road, Borough.	ditto -	10	500	20
Caleb Field, for self and partner.	Stock Exchange -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
Thomas William Warre -	13, Holles-street, Cavendish-square.	ditto -	10	500	20
William Rickard - -	Stock Exchange -	ditto -	25	1,250	50
Edward Richards Adams	Elmer Lodge, Beckenham.	ditto -	25	1,250	50
Alfred Alers Hankey -	2, North Piazza, Royal Exchange.	ditto -	30	1,500	60
John Thomas - - -	Stock Exchange -	ditto -	50	2,500	100
John Bleaden - -	47, Lothbury - -	stationer -	10	500	20
Walter Thomas Fawcett	6, Adelaide-pl., London-bridge.	gentleman -	10	500	20
George Chilton, jun. -	3, Harcourt-buildings, Temple.	esquire -	40	2,000	80
Henry Charles Chilton -	7, Chancery-lane -	solicitor -	20	1,000	40
C. Spencer Compton, jun.	2, Bank Chambers -	gentleman -	20	1,000	40
Andrew Leith Hay -	29, Eaton-square -	knight, M. P.	50	2,500	100
David Tyrie - - -	Stock Exchange -	gentleman -	10	500	20
William Potts Bathe, for self and partners.	Bishopsgate-street -	merchants -	100	5,000	200

No. 18.
Subscription List for Session 1836.

Christian and Surname of Subscribers.	Subscribers' Places of Abode.	Subscribers' Quality or Calling.	No. of Shares.	Sums subscribed by each Subscriber.	Deposit paid.
				£.	£.
William Potts Bathe -	Bishopsgate-street -	merchant -	40	2,000	80
Richard Preston Prichard	Lawrence-lane - -	ditto -	30	1,500	60
Henry Burnand - -	Lloyd's - - -	insurance-broker.	10	500	20
Frederic Foireaux Weiss, for self and partners.	62, Strand - -	surgical instrument-makers.	4	200	8
William Cash - -	39, Wood-street -	woollen-draper	50	2,500	100
John Matthey - -	23, Doughty-street -	gentleman -	50	2,500	100
James Charles Dalbiac -	34, Cavendish-square	major-general	50	2,500	100
Isaac Solly, jun. - -	15, St. Mary Axe	merchant -	30	1,500	60
William Henry Edmonds	27, Bush-lane - -	ditto -	15	750	30
Robert Ord - - -	23, Threadneedle-st.	broker -	10	500	20
John Fitzmoore Halsey -	Gaddesden-park -	clerk - -	40	2,000	80
Peter John Thomas Pearse	6, Frederick's-place -	gentleman -	15	750	30
Francis Harris - -	Croydon - - -	surgeon -	40	2,000	80
Josiah Wilson - -	27, Cateaton-street -	clothier -	25	1,250	50
Samuel Smith - -	4, York-chambers, St. James's-street.	gentleman -	15	750	30
John Simeon Smith -	17, Trinity-square -	surgeon -	25	1,250	50
Hylton Jolliffe - -	62, Pall Mall - -	gentleman -	20	1,000	40
Andrew Smith - -	1, Birchin-lane -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
Josiah Wilson, for self and partners.	27, Cateaton-street -	clothiers -	25	1,250	50
George Hayward - -	Brighton - - -	gentleman -	20	1,000	40
John Mair Innes - -	1, New-court - -	merchant -	10	500	20
George James Gordon -	31, Upper Gower-st.	gentleman -	10	500	20
William Soltan - -	15, St. Helen's-place	merchant -	20	1,000	40
Jane Gordon - -	31, Upper Gower-st.	widow -	20	1,000	40
John Charles M'Mullen	Stock Exchange -	gentleman -	10	500	20
John Follett - -	6, Austin-friars -	ditto -	25	1,250	50
Pompey Anichini - -	28, Commercial Sale-rooms.	merchant -	5	250	10
Richard Harman Lloyd	Lombard-street -	gentleman -	40	2,000	80
Thomas Henry Parker -	Stock Exchange -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
George Nicholas - -	3, Abchurch-lane -	ditto -	75	3,750	150
Alexander M'Muth -	Tottenham - -	ditto -	5	250	10
William Gambier - -	Sacomb-park, Hertfordshire.	ditto	50	2,500	100
Edward Crowley - -	Lavender-hill, Wandsworth-road.	ditto -	100	5,000	200
John Utterton - -	Croydon - - -	lieutenant-col.	75	3,750	150
George Palmer - -	North Piazza, Royal Exchange.	broker -	25	1,250	50
Henry James Stubbs, jun.	Sutton, Surrey -	gentleman -	20	1,000	40
William May Simons -	80, Old Broad-street	broker -	25	1,250	50
Ralph Caldwell Crafton	Croydon - - -	chemist -	25	1,250	50
Frederick Bankart -	34, Clement's-lane, Lombard-street.	attorney -	10	500	20
William Morris - -	32, Lombard-street -	discount-brok^{r}	25	1,250	50
John Stevens - -	48, Lime-street -	wine-merchant	10	500	20
Thomas Mellish - -	Kender-st., New-cross	gentleman -	10	500	20
Richard Jennings - -	21, Portland-place -	ditto -	25	1,250	50
Henry Stock - -	36, Mincing-lane -	esquire -	25	1,250	50
Lewis Levi - - -	Brompton - -	gentleman -	25	1,250	50
Robert Short - -	Threadneedle-street -	ditto -	10	500	20
William Henry Ogden -	7, Basinghall-street -	factor -	15	750	30
Thomas Sinclair Robinson	Brighton - -	gentleman -	20	1,000	40
George Granville Grenfell	59, Gloucester-place, Portman-square.	ditto -	5	250	10
Charles Henry Ashley -	7, Suffolk-lane - -	merchant -	15	750	30
Thomas William Bell -	23, Cumberland-street	gentleman -	25	1,250	50
George Rennie - -	21, Whitehall-place -	ditto -	150	7,500	300
Butler Scott - - -	Gray's-build. Kingsland	ditto -	10	500	20
Henry Attride - -	20, Albany-road, Camberwell.	ditto -	10	500	20
David Salomons - -	16, Cumberland-street	ditto -	50	2,500	100
Richard Sommers Gard -	32, Lombard-street -	ditto -	25	1,250	50

No. 18.
Subscription List for Session 1836.

Christian and Surname of Subscribers.	Subscribers' Places of Abode.	Subscribers' Quality or Calling.	No. of Shares.	Sums subscribed by each Subscriber.	Deposit paid.
				£.	£.
Stephen Charles Hope -	2, North Piazza, Royal Exchange.	gentleman -	10	500	20
William Oliver Dodgson	2, North Piazza, Royal Exchange.	ditto -	10	500	20
Burnand and Sandeman -	12, Cornhill - -	ditto -	20	1,000	40
William Pemberton -	6, Freeman's-court -	merchant -	15	750	30
Matthias Wolverly Attwood	27, Gracechurch-street	gentleman -	50	2,500	100
James Wettenhall - -	Stock Exchange -	ditto -	10	500	20
Henry Hughes - -	Basinghall-street -	broker -	10	500	20
Henry Hughes, for self and partner.	Basinghall-street -	brokers -	5	250	10
Henry Moore - -	Junior United Service Club.	captain, unattached.	5	250	10
James Dorrien - -	12, Mincing-lane -	gentleman -	10	500	20
William Pym - -	39, Park-street, Grosvenor-square.	knight -	50	2,500	100
Henry Eaton - -	10, Lancaster-pl. Strand	gentleman -	15	750	30
Charles Towgood - -	29, Clement's-lane -	banker -	50	2,500	100
Andrew Garrett - -	25, Crutched-friars -	traveller -	50	2,500	100
Herbert Mortimer - -	10, Bush-lane - -	merchant -	10	500	20
John Cox - - -	Croydon - - -	ditto -	25	1,250	50
William Bennett - -	Croydon - - -	gentleman -	5	250	10
John Groves - - -	Billiter-street - -	merchant -	75	3,750	150
Thomas Smith - -	Goswell-street - -	grocer -	2	100	4
Henry Dixon - -	Witham, Essex -	surgeon -	90	4,500	180
Daniel Whittle Harvey -	Little George-street -	esquire -	100	5,000	200
John Clayton - -	10, Lancaster-pl. Strand	gentleman -	15	750	30
John Thomas Briggs -	6, Somerset-place, Somerset-house, Strand.	Accountant-general of the Navy.	100	5,000	200
Daniel Mocatta - -	Brixton-hill - -	gentleman -	25	1,250	50
Sarah Nattrass - -	West-lodge, Clapham	spinster -	10	500	20
George Soanes - -	5, Austin-friars -	broker -	25	1,250	50
Gilbert Stephens - -	13, Doughty-street -	solicitor -	5	250	10
John James Short - -	Stock Exchange -	broker -	100	5,000	200
Samuel George - -	Denmark-hill - -	gentleman -	5	250	10
William Froom - -	136, Strand - -	plate-glass manufacturer.	35	1,750	70
Abraham Cohen - -	12, Canonbury-place, Islington.	gentleman -	15	750	30
Francis Tuke - -	25, Crutched-friars -	merchant -	50	2,500	100
George Chilton - -	Sydenham, Kent -	esquire -	20	1,000	40
Thos. Somers Cocks, jun.	Charing-cross - -	ditto -	25	1,250	50
Matthias Wolverly Attwood	27, Gracechurch-street	gentleman -	75	3,750	150
Thomas Francis - -	5, Angel-court - -	stockbroker	15	750	30
George Stevenson - -	40, Tavistock-street -	gentleman -	5	250	10
William Little - -	15, Bishopsgate-street	ditto -	25	1,250	50
Edward Parratt - -	11, Pal Mall - -	esquire -	20	1,000	40
William Rothery - -	Doctors' Commons -	ditto -	25	1,250	50
G. Baranskill Lonsdale -	New Broad-street -	gentleman -	10	500	20
Wm. Carmichael Smythe	2, Raymond-buildings, Gray's-inn.	esquire -	20	1,000	40
John Richard Elmore -	9, New Cavendish-st.	M. D. - -	50	2,500	100
Edward Lyon - -	2, Birchin-lane, Cornhill	broker -	15	750	30
Joseph Della Torre -	9, Lamb's Conduit-st.	merchant -	10	500	20
Gustavus Flindt - -	7, Bath-terrace, Camberwell-road.	gentleman -	20	1,000	40
Daniel Gibson - -	49, St. George's-terrace, Gravesend.	ditto -	50	2,500	100
Henry Drewitt - -	2, Gower-pl. Euston-sq.	ditto -	55	2,750	110
James West - - -	Clayton-pl. Kennington	auctioneer -	35	1,750	70
Charles Thomas Capron	6, Barnard's-inn, Holb.	gentleman -	5	250	10
Daniel Wilkinson - -	12, George-yard -	merchant -	70	3,500	140
John Sherring Clark -	15, Doughty-street -	gentleman -	50	2,500	100
William Alex. Thomas -	50, Threadneedle-street	broker -	20	1,000	40
James West, junior -	7, Clayton-place, Kennington.	ditto -	10	500	20

No. 18.
Subscription List for Session 1836.

Christian and Surname of Subscribers.	Subscribers' Places of Abode.	Subscribers' Quality or Calling.	No. of Shares.	Sums subscribed by each Subscriber.	Deposit paid.
				£.	£.
John Sherring Clark	15, Doughty-street	gentleman	50	2,500	100
John Alers Hankey	Fenchurch-street	banker	20	1,000	40
Thomas Alers Hankey	Fenchurch-street	ditto	20	1,000	40
Thomas Godwin	Millbank-st. Westm.	gentleman	10	500	20
Henry Josi	London-house-yard	merchant	25	1,250	50
Robert Dering	Lockley's, Welwyn	esquire	75	3,750	150
John Harman	Croydon	brewer	100	5,000	200
Abraham John Valpy	Sussex-pl. Regent's-pk.	gentleman	10	500	20
George Frederick Hotham	Woolmer's, Hertford	Captain, R. N.	40	2,000	80
Thomas Hankey	Fenchurch-street	banker	35	1,750	70
Edward Owen	St. Leonard's Parsonage, Wendover.	clerk	20	1,000	40
William Hanham	Wimborn, Dorset	gentleman	125	6,250	250
Robert Sutton, jun., by power of attorney, for John Harris.	Plymouth	banker	100	5,000	200
Mary Wood	Great Queen-street	widow	25	1,250	50
James St. Clair	Chipstead	The Hon.	25	1,250	50
Thomas Buchan Hepburn	Smeaton, Haddingtonshire.	baronet	20	1,000	40
Archibald Little	Shabden-park	esquire	50	2,500	100
John Pocock	Brighton	gentleman	10	500	20
Richard Newnham	Brighton	surgeon	50	2,500	100
Richard Heaviside	Brighton	gentleman	50	2,500	100
John Hilton	Brighton	grocer	25	1,250	50
Alexander Gordon	Brighton	steward to Mrs. Combe.	10	500	20
Edward Cornford	Brighton	solicitor	10	500	20
Eardley N. Hall	Brighton	gentleman	40	2,000	80
John Watson	Wick-lodge, Brighton	esquire	10	500	20
Thomas Robert Jefferson	Brighton	M. D.	20	1,000	40
Robert Pedder	Brighton	gentleman	80	4,000	160
Hugh Fuller	Portslade	yeoman	20	1,000	40
John Patching	Brighton	builder	20	1,000	40
Paul Hewitt	Brighton	gentleman	10	500	20
John Good	Brighton	hairdresser	20	1,000	40
William Jolly	Brighton	grocer	20	1,000	40
Robert Taylor	Brighton	surgeon	100	5,000	200
William Dawson Savage	Brighton	chemist	6	300	12
John Brooker Vallance	Hove	gentleman	12	600	24
David Holmes	Brighton	esquire	80	4,000	160
Thomas Richard Rooper	Wick-hill, Brighton	clerk	10	500	20
Rev. Edward Everard	The Wick	clerk, D. D.	10	500	20
Stephen T. Hodd	Brighton	innkeeper	5	250	10
John Yearsley	Brighton	ironmonger	5	250	10
Isaac Bass	Brighton	merchant	25	1,250	50
John Fletcher	Brighton	gentleman	20	1,000	40
George Matthews	Brighton	grocer	5	250	10
Joseph Graveley	Brighton	brewer	5	250	10
Thomas Cooper	Brighton	hotel-keeper	20	1,000	40
Edward Lumley Wilson	Brighton	gentleman	30	1,500	60
Benjamin Davis	Brighton	ditto	100	5,000	200
Charles Price	Brighton	M. D.	30	1,500	60
John Hall	Brighton	banker	5	250	10
Thomas West	Brighton	ditto	5	250	10
John Hamlin Borrer	Brighton	ditto	25	1,250	50
Eardley Nicholas Hall	Brighton	ditto	5	250	10
R. S. Cahill	Brighton	gentleman	10	500	20
E. H. Creasy	Brighton	auctioneer	15	750	30
Thomas Winter	Brighton	gentleman	5	250	10
James Henry Mills	Brighton	auctioneer	10	500	20
Joseph Langridge	Brighton	silversmith	50	2,500	100
Edwin Thunder	Brighton	shoemaker	10	500	20
Edmund Savage	Brighton	wine-mercht.	10	500	20
Samuel Ridley	Brighton	auctioneer	10	500	20
Richard Stuckey	Brighton	innkeeper	10	500	20
J. Lamprell	Brighton	baths	10	500	20

No. 18.
Subscription List for Session 1836.

Christian and Surname of Subscribers.	Subscribers' Places of Abode.	Subscribers' Quality or Calling.	No. of Shares.	Sums subscribed by each Subscriber.	Deposit paid.
				£.	£.
William Wilton	Brighton	surgeon	40	2,000	80
E. H. Creasy	Brighton	auctioneer	15	750	30
Thomas Goodall	Portland-pl. Brighton	esquire	20	1,000	40
James Mills	Mills-terrace, Hove	gentleman	10	500	20
John Shearman	Brighton	captain	10	500	20
Arthur Benj. Clifton	Brighton	major-gen.	20	1,000	40
Robert Lewis	Brighton	gentleman	10	500	20
Thomas Dicker	Lewes	banker	15	750	30
W. Hallett	Brighton	builder	50	2,500	100
Wm. Pearce Dadley	Brighton	gentleman	5	250	10
Henry Blaber	Brighton	collector of poor-rates.	5	250	10
Joseph Langridge, jun.	Brighton	goldsmith	10	500	20
Alexander Gordon	Brighton	steward, Mrs. Combe.	10	500	20
Josiah Browne	Brighton	wine-merchant	5	250	10
Francis Brown	Brighton	ditto	5	250	10
George Tamplin	Brighton	gentleman	10	500	20
James English	Brighton	hairdresser	10	500	20
Sydney Walsingham Bennett.	Brighton	solicitor	5	250	10
Ebenezer Robins	Brighton	wine-merchant	5	250	10
William Blacklock	Brighton	chemist	5	250	10
G. Harrison	Brighton	hotel-keeper	5	250	10
Thomas Wisden	Brighton	builder	5	250	10
R. S. Cahill	Brighton	gentleman	100	5,000	200
Richard Davey	Brighton	grocer	3	150	6
James Lipscombe	Brighton	perfumer	5	250	10
Francis Brown	17, Black Lion-street, Brighton.	wine-merchant	5	250	10
John Rogers	Brighton	florist	5	250	10
William Styan	Winchester-place	esquire	20	1,000	40
Lord Monson	Gatton-park		30	1,500	60
William Brown	46, Lime-street	wine-agent	10	500	20
Wm. Towgood, by Henry Towgood, his attorney.	Cardiff	banker	10	500	20
Thomas Lamie Murray	39, Old Broad-street	ditto	100	5,000	200
Christopher Fitz-Simon	Glancullin, Dublin	M. P.	50	2,500	100
Walter Moore Fowler	23, Change-alley	gentleman	10	500	20
John Robertson	Warnford-court	merchant	100	5,000	200
George Stephenson	40, Tavistock-street	gentleman	10	500	20
Matthias Wilks	Broom-park	ditto	400	20,000	800
Wm. George Hylton Jolliffe	Merstham, Surrey	baronet	100	5,000	200
Jonathan Thorp	30, King-st. Cheapside	merchant	400	20,000	800
Charles Sedgfield Crowley	Croydon	gentleman	400	20,000	800
Joseph Brown Wilks	Brighton	ditto	400	20,000	800
James Rennie	Whitehall	ditto	100	5,000	200
Robert Sutton, jun.	Stock Exchange	esquire	400	20,000	800
George Stevenson	Tavistock-street	gentleman	5	250	10
Richard Heaviside	Brighton	ditto	12	600	24
William Braid, by Joseph Brown Wilks.	Tandridge-court, Godstone.	ditto	5	250	10
Joseph Brown Wilks	Brighton	ditto	100	5,000	200
John Harman	Croydon	brewer	400	20,000	800
Anthony Harman, by John Harman.	Tunbridge	ditto	20	1,000	40
Thomas Sinclair Robinson	Brighton	gentleman	100	5,000	200
Benjamin Davis	Brighton	ditto	100	5,000	200
Richard Heaviside	Brighton	ditto	100	5,000	200
Denzil J. Thomson	Marine-parade, Brighton	ditto	10	500	20
T. Lamie Murray	39, Old Broad-street	banker	75	3,750	150
Henry Smith	8, Blackman-street	dyer	15	750	30
Robert Sutton, jun.	44, Hamilton-terrace	esquire	36	1,800	72
		Total	15,985	799,250	31,970

397 Subscribers.

Appendix, No. 19.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.—1837.

SIGNATURE of each Subscriber.	PLACE of ABODE.	Quality or Calling.	Seals.	Number of Shares.	Amount of Subscription.	WITNESS.
					£.	
Edward Chamberlain Faithfull	5, King's-road, Bedford-row.	solicitor -	(L. S.)	76	5,700	
John Edward Ladbury - -	7, Upper Fitzroy-st.	gentleman -	—	20	1,500	
William Howard - - -	12, Copthall-court	gentleman -	—	11	825	
Edward Humphreys - -	12, Draycott-street, Chelsea.	carpenter -	—	50	3,750	
Francis Rivington - -	3, Waterloo-place -	bookseller -	—	5	375	
George Aston - - -	7, Dorset - place, North, Clapham-rd.	gentleman -	—	60	4,500	
Frederick Henry Smith -	11, Peckham-grove, Camberwell.	gentleman -	—	10	750	
John Edwards - - -	29, Duke - street, Manchester-sq.	gentleman -	—	30	2,250	
William G. H. Jolliffe - -	Merstham, Surrey	baronet -	—	60	4,500	
Thomas Cundy - - -	13, Chester-square	architect -	—	20	1,500	
Thomas Frederick Everingham	21, Little Phillimore-place, Kensington.	gentleman -	—	5	375	
James Wyatt - - -	Aylesbury - -	coachman -	—	20	1,500	
John Procter - - -	18, Cheapside -	warehouseman	—	20	1,500	
Samuel Carr - - -	Stock Exchange -	gentleman -	—	5	375	
John Honeywill - - -	Brooksby-street, Islington.	gentleman -	—	5	375	
Thomas Hankey - - -	Fenchurch-street -	banker - -	—	50	3,750	
Archibald Freeman - - -	9, Billiter-square -	gentleman -	—	10	750	
Robert Bennett Thompson -	58, Cloudesley-terrace, Islington.	gentleman -	—	25	1,875	
John Bleaden - - -	Lothbury - -	stationer -	—	10	750	
Samuel John Leveridge -	Northumberland-st.	wine-merchant	—	20	1,500	
Thomas Elliman - - -	Tring - - - -	draper - -	—	40	3,000	
John Haley - - - -	8, Thomas - street, Mile-end.	shopkeeper -	—	10	750	
Andrew Johnstone - -	18, Providence-row, Finsbury.	gentleman -	—	15	1,125	Geo. H. Lake.
William Coulton - - -	Surrey Canal-house, Old Kent-road.	victualler -	—	5	375	
George Parbury - - -	34, New Broad-st.	merchant -	—	20	1,500	
John Jarvis - - -	47, Conduit-street, Bond-street.	clothier - -	—	40	3,000	
John Haley - - - -	8, Thomas - street, Mile-end.	shopkeeper -	—	5	375	
George Heath - - -	122, Bishopsgate-street Without.	builder - -	—	20	1,500	
William Cooke - - -	7, Keppel-row, Stoke Newington.	gentleman -	—	100	7,500	
William Aitkin Brown - -	23, Park - street, Southwark.	gentleman -	—	15	1,125	
James Jephson - - -	20, Upper Berkeley-street, West.	gentleman -	—	20	1,500	
Joseph Barton - - -	Stock Exchange -	gentleman -	—	20	1,500	
John Jackson - - -	14, Dorset-crescent	gentleman -	—	20	1,500	
Joseph Gifford - - -	104, Strand - -	druggist -	—	10	750	
John Entwisle - - -	6, Great Winchester-street.	merchant -	—	60	4,500	
Charles Moring - - -	7, Ferdinand - terrace, Hampstead-rd.	gentleman -	—	25	1,875	
John Barker - - -	77, Basinghall-street	broker - -	—	10	750	
Charles Sedgfield Crowley -	Croydon - - -	gentleman -	—	50	3,750	
Thomas Bayley - - - -	10, China - terrace, Lambeth.	merchant -	—	10	750	
Thomas Daly - - -	Tavistock-pl. Cheltenham.	gentleman -	—	20	1,500	
George Baber - - -	King-st. Long-acre	gentleman -	—	10	750	
John Fielden - - -	51, Paddington-st.	gentleman -	—	40	3,000	
Charles Cancellor - -	24, Threadneedle-st.	gentleman -	—	50	3,750	

(*continued*)

SIGNATURE of each Subscriber.	PLACE OF ABODE.	Quality or Calling.	Seals.	Number of Shares.	Amount of Subscription.	WITNESS.
					£.	
Thomas Cruttwell	Bath	gentleman	(L. S.)	5	375	Geo. H. Lake.
Henry Walmisley	15, Stockbridge-terrace, Pimlico.	gentleman	—	10	750	
Izardoie Heilbronn	Stroud, Gloucestersh.	wool-dealer	—	30	2,250	Aug. D. Smith.
Thomas Deeble Dutton	Stones-end, Borough	boot-maker	—	30	2,250	
George Appleyard	27, St. James's-pl.	gentleman	—	70	5,250	
George Walker	7, Old-change	draper	—	35	2,625	
Joseph Thompson	Old-change	merchant	—	25	1,875	
Thomas Corbett	Bedford-row	gentleman	—	30	2,250	
Henry Thomas Worley	34, St. James's-place	gentleman	—	20	1,500	
William George Legge	4, Dorchester-place	gentleman	—	40	3,000	
Arthur Harry Johnson	7, Maiden-la., Wood-street.	gentleman	—	40	3,000	
John Ames	Green-st., London	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
Richard Ware Cole	7, Old-change	merchant	—	15	1,125	
Alfred Rider	Cold Harbour-lane, Camberwell.	gentleman	—	130	9,750	
Jonas Smith	Rahere-st. Goswell-road.	gentleman	—	5	375	Geo. H. Lake.
Andrew Duncan	8, South-sq. Gray's-inn.	gentleman	—	30	2,250	
Antonio Joaquin Soares	36, Crutched-friars	gentleman	—	200	15,000	
Samuel Carr	Stock Exchange	gentleman	—	110	8,250	
Thomas Adams	11, Cheapside	gentleman	—	15	1,125	
Thomas Duck Hopper	29, Colet-pl. Commercial-road.	gentleman	—	10	750	
Thomas Smith Goode	125, Market-st. Manchester.	manufacturer	—	30	2,250	
Sidney Smith Dipnall	Peckham, Surrey	gentleman	—	5	375	
George Graham	49, Old-change	merchant	—	15	1,125	
John Beetham Jackson	6, Watling-street	warehouseman	—	15	1,125	
Robert Sutton, jun.	7, Castle-alley	gentleman	—	210	15,750	
John Augustus Thrupp	6, Spanish-place	gentleman	—	100	7,500	
Joseph Robertson Raines	92, Aldersgate-st.	surgeon	—	10	750	
Joseph Prestwich	20, Mark-lane	merchant	—	10	750	
George Vernon	10, Basinghall-st.	merchant	—	35	2,625	
Edward Baldwin	New Bridge-street	gentleman	—	5	375	
Robert Smith	16, Size-lane	merchant	—	5	375	
Charles Edward Searle	38, Hatton-garden	gentleman	—	3	225	
Thomas Mortimer Cleobury	12, Montague-street, Russell-square.	solicitor	—	50	3,750	
Hopper Banks	31, Colet-place	gentleman	—	10	750	
George Parbury	34, New Broad-st.	merchant	—	10	750	
Frederick Valle	21, Haymarket	merchant	—	200	15,000	
Benjamin Bacon Williams	70, Portland-place	gentleman	—	53	3,975	
William Cook	22, St. Paul's Churchyard.	merchant	—	50	3,750	F. C. Jackson.
Henry Starling	43, Gt. Cambridge-st. Hackney-road.	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
Henry Cooke	8, Hounsditch	gentleman	—	125	9,375	
Christopher Truman	23, Wood-street	merchant	—	15	1,125	
Thomas Montresor	36, Lincoln's-inn-fields.	barrister	—	5	375	
Thomas Daun	Reigate	merchant	—	10	750	
Thomas Neale	ditto	gentleman	—	130	9,750	
Thomas Goodall	Brighton	esquire	—	250	18,750	
Thomas Combe Williams	Cowley-grove, Middlesex.	merchant	—	20	1,500	
John Harman	Croydon	brewer	—	50	3,750	
Henry Carmichael Smyth	Albion-street, Hyde-park.	esquire	—	110	8,250	
George Wenham Lewis	130, Jermyn-street	esquire	—	25	1,875	
George Rose Innes	5, Lyons-inn	solicitor	—	25	1,875	Geo. J. Till.
Edward Marlborough	Ave Maria-lane	news-agent	—	10	750	
George Sanders	58, Southampton-st. Camberwell.	gentleman	—	10	750	
Thomas Sinclair Robinson	Brighton	gentleman	—	45	3,375	F. C. Jackson.
Robert Pearce	Lambeth	gentleman	—	10	750	
William Cooke	Keppel-row, Stoke Newington-green.	gentleman	—	82	6,150	

SIGNATURE of each Subscriber.	PLACE of ABODE.	Quality or Calling.	Seals.	Number of Shares.	Amount of Subscription.	WITNESS.
					£.	
Henry Skurrock	Blackheath	gentleman	(L. S.)	20	1,500	
Samuel Allen	Homerton	gentleman	—	5	375	
William Cash	39, Wood-street	woollen-ware-houseman.	—	20	1,500	
John Parker Nuttall	4, Adam-street	esquire	—	50	3,750	
John Harman	Croydon	gentleman	—	200	15,000	F. C. Jackson.
Charles Sedgfield Crowley	ditto	gentleman	—	150	11,250	
William James Mackay	69, Old Broad-street	gentleman	—	30	2,250	
Harvey Gem	24, Wimpole-street	gentleman	—	5	375	
Michael Kearney	9, Adam-street	gentleman	—	5	375	
The Right Hon. Frederick John Lord Monson.	Gatton-park	-	—	30	2,250	
James Stride	124, Wood-street	merchant	—	45	3,375	H. Dean.
William Chance	Birmingham	merchant	—	50	3,750	
William Wallis	Whitechapel	draper	—	5	375	
Richard Blackmore	Trafalgar-pl., West, Hackney-road.	broker	—	10	750	
Matthias Wilks	Broom-park	gentleman	—	95	7,125	
Joseph Browne Wilks	Sussex-sq. Brighton	gentleman	—	50	3,750	F. C. Jackson.
Rob. Newbigging Cavincross	24, May's-buildings	gentleman	—	10	750	
Thomas Somers Cocks, jun.	Charing-cross	gentleman	—	150	11,250	
Richard Silvester Cahill	Brighton	gentleman	—	20	1,500	
George Lewin	18, Chapel-place, Bermondsey.	accountant	—	50	3,750	
William Alers Hankey	Fenchurch-street	banker	—	25	1,875	
Michael Longstaff	St. Paul's Church-yard.	warehouseman	—	60	4,500	
Edward Owen	St. Leonard's, Wen-dover.	clerk	—	50	3,750	
Robert Lowe	7, Albion-place	gentleman	—	50	3,750	H. Dean.
Robert Sutton, jun.	Hamilton-terrace	gentleman	—	205	15,375	
John Alers Hankey	Fenchurch-street	banker	—	20	1,500	
Thomas Alers Hankey	ditto	banker	—	20	1,500	
James Swaby	54, Oxford-terrace	gentleman	—	200	15,000	F. C. Jackson.
Robert Melbourne Memess	9, Throgmorton-st.	gentleman	—	10	750	
William Geo. Hylton Jolliffe	Merstham, Surrey	baronet	—	5	375	H. Dean.
William Morland	Cow-lane, Peckham	gentleman	—	5	375	
George Knox	14, Lower Islington-terrace.	gentleman	—	10	750	
Richard Hunt	13, Fenchurch-street	gentleman	—	20	1,500	
William Kingdom	Pall Mall	gentleman	—	300	22,500	
Henry Cooke	8, Houndsditch	gentleman	—	100	7,500	
Henry Ashby	Staines	banker	—	10	750	
Thomas Osborn Dobson	Wrexham	surgeon	—	5	375	
William Rickford Collett	St. James's Hotel, St. James's-street.	gentleman	—	10	750	
Thomas King	Marine Society, Bishopsgate-street.	gentleman	—	5	375	F. C. Jackson.
Alexander James Geddes	17, Eccleston-street	gentleman	—	15	1,125	
Jonas Smith	Rahere-street, Gos-well-road.	gentleman	—	10	750	
Samuel Carr	Stock Exchange	gentleman	—	819	61,425	
Robert Hook	18, King-street, St. James's.	gentleman	—	20	1,500	
James West	7, Clayton-place, Kennington.	auctioneer	—	10	750	
William Litchfield	24, Finch-lane	gentleman	—	10	750	
George Vernon	10, Basinghall-street	merchant	—	5	375	John Becket.
Charles Hogleton	10, John-st. Adelphi	gentleman	—	10	750	
Alfred Alers Hankey	2, North Piazza, Royal Exchange.	gentleman	—	10	750	
Edward Hill	39, Old Broad-st.	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
Joseph Robert Charnley	Lloyd's	broker	—	10	750	
Robert Butler	Grove-end-place	gentleman	—	10	750	F. C. Jackson.
Peter Bunnell	St. Martin's-le-grand	warehouseman	—	10	750	
Owen Tickell Alger	37, Bedford-row	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
Samuel Carr	3, Upper Charles-st. Northampton-sq.	gentleman	—	500	37,500	
Edward Northcote	45, Old Change	warehouseman	—	20	1,500	

(*continued*)

SIGNATURE of each Subscriber.	PLACE of ABODE.	Quality or Calling.	Seals.	Number of Shares.	Amo of Subscription.	WITNESS.
					£.	
Thomas Turner	2, Hercules-passage, Threadneedle-st.	gentleman	(L. S.)	5	375	
Ligonier Thomas	16, Goulden-terrace	gentleman	—	20	1,500	
Charles Billett	Manor-place, Walworth.	gentleman	—	20	1,500	
Edward Willson	Copthall-court	gentleman	—	5	375	
James Ferguson Saunders	50, New Bond-street	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
John Gottlieb Anthony	71, Cornhill	gentleman	—	25	1,875	
Edward Oxenford	44, Mecklenburgh-sq.	gentleman	—	10	750	
Thomas Huxley	21, Upper Seymour-street.	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
William Cash	39, Wood-street	woollen-warehouseman.	—	20	1,500	F. C. Jackson.
William Hall	Mount Nod, Streatham, Surrey.	gentleman	—	215	16,125	
James Weedon	Cursitor-street	stationer	—	10	750	
George Paternoster	Kent-road	chemist	—	5	375	
William Haigh	Clapham-common	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
John Sloane	Northumberland-st.	gentleman	—	10	750	
Rober Willis Viger	355, Strand	gentleman	—	2	150	
Thomas Turner	2, Hercules-passage, Threadneedle-st.	gentleman	—	165	12,375	
William Peters	Minories	gentleman	—	35	2,625	
John William Hamilton	40, Broad-st.-build.	gentleman	—	5	375	
William Spencer	2, Elm-court, Temple	barrister	—	255	19,125	G. J. Till.
William Kingdom	Pall Mall	gentleman	—	132	9,900	
Robert Holderness	Camden-cottages, Camden-town.	gentleman	—	20	1,500	
William Oliver Dodgson	2, North Piazza, Royal Exchange.	gentleman	—	10	750	
James West, jun.	2, Bartholomew-lane	gentleman	—	30	2,250	
Benjamin Wheeler Poulton	Staines-road, Hounslow.	gentleman	—	510	38,250	
Henry Frederick Warner	39, Lothbury	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
Robert Sutton, jun.	Stock Exchange	gentleman	—	200	15,000	
Thomas Godwin	ditto	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
William Kingdom	Pall Mall	gentleman	—	35	2,625	
William Smith	North-st. Islington	gentleman	—	5	375	
John Edwards	107, Stamford-street	merchant	—	20	1,500	
Henry Newark	8, Lane-lane	merchant	—	5	375	
James Swaby	54, Oxford-terrace	gentleman	—	40	3,000	F. C. Jackson.
John Harman	Croydon	gentleman	—	50	3,750	
George Wedd	7, London-street	cornfactor	—	10	750	
William Olney	Tring	brewer	—	50	3,750	
John Beetham Jackson	5, Copthall-court	merchant	—	20	1,500	
John Ireland	7, Ironmonger-lane	gentleman	—	20	1,500	
William Spencer	2, Elm-court, Temple	barrister	—	50	3,750	
William Mackay	69, Old Broad-street	gentleman	—	25	1,875	
Henry Thornton	Camberwell	gentleman	—	30	2,250	
Benjamin Woolf Franklin	Liverpool	merchant	—	15	1,125	
James Swaby	54, Oxford-terrace	gentleman	—	250	18,750	
Charles Sedgfield Crowley	Croydon, Surrey	gentleman	—	250	18,750	
Joseph Browne Wilks	Brighton	gentleman	—	300	22,500	
Thomas Sinclair Robinson	ditto	esquire	—	300	22,500	
John Harman	Croydon	gentleman	—	300	22,500	
Benjamin Davis	Brighton	gentleman	—	300	22,500	
John Harman	Croydon	gentleman	—	100	7,500	
Matthew Bolton Rennie	Whitehall	gentleman	—	125	9,375	John Beckett.
John Crosthwaite, by power of attorney, John Fox.	Liverpool	merchant	—	100	7,500	
Robert Sutton, jun.	7, Castle-alley	gentleman	—	70	5,250	Aug. D. Smith.
James Rennie	Whitehall	gentleman	—	125	9,375	F. C. Jackson.
Thomas Oak Smith	13, Gloucester-place	gentleman	—	10	750	
Sidney Walsingham Bennett	63, Middle-street	solicitor	—	5	375	
Robert Ward	85, London-road	gentleman	—	100	7,500	
James Lipscombe	59, Grand-parade	perfumer	—	1	75	Franklin Langridge.
Joseph Langridge	Union-street	silversmith	—	25	1,875	
John Good	18, East-street	perfumer	—	10	750	
John Patching	20, Duke-street	builder	—	15	1,125	

SIGNATURE of each Subscriber.	PLACE of ABODE.	Quality or Calling.	Seals.	Number of Shares.	Amount of Subscription.	WITNESS.
					£.	
John Hilton	Church-street	grocer	(L. S.)	10	750	Franklin Langridge.
Geo. Matthews & James Wilcox	North-st., Brighton	grocers	—	5	375	
Francis Brown	Black Lion-street, Brighton.	wine-merchant	—	35	2,625	
Thomas Wood	Lewes	brewer	—	50	3,750	Ar. R. Briggs.
Richard Silvester Cahill	Kemp-town, Brighton	gentleman	—	20	1,500	Franklin Langridge.
Richard Heaviside	Hove	gentleman	—	70	5,250	
Joseph Browne Wilks	Kemp-town, Brighton	gentleman	—	72	5,400	
William Dawson Savage	Edward-street	chemist, &c.	—	10	750	
George Lynn	Cannon-place	builder	—	39	2,925	
Arthur Clifton	Brighton	major-general	—	20	1,500	
Thomas Goodall	ditto	gentleman	—	150	11,250	
Benjamin Davis	ditto	gentleman	—	80	6,000	
Paul Hewitt	ditto	gentleman	—	10	750	
William Wilton	ditto	gentleman	—	14	1,050	
Samuel Lyons	ditto	clothier	—	20	1,500	
Thomas Dicker	Lewes	banker	—	5	375	J. L. Edwards.
Thomas Somers Cocks	Charing-cross	gentleman	—	15	1,125	H. J. Davis.
Ralph Leigh	Wigan, Lancashire	attorney-at-law	—	20	1,500	
Joseph Fry	Liverpool	merchant	—	10	750	
William Milner	ditto	manufacturer	—	10	750	
Henry Solomon Samuel	ditto	watch-manufac.	—	10	750	
Joseph Raleigh	Manchester	merchant	—	50	3,750	
John Watson	ditto	merchant	—	40	3,000	
Robert Sutton, jun.	Stock Exchange	gentleman	—	250	18,750	Aug. D. Smith.
			£.		991,425	

Appendix, No. 20.

No. 20. List of Subscribers on the old, as well as upon the new Deed, with the Sums subscribed by them.

A LIST of the PERSONS who were Subscribers on the old Deed, and are also Subscribers on the new Deed, with the Sums subscribed by them as well upon the old as upon the new Deed.

NAMES.	OLD DEED.		NEW DEED.	
	Number of Shares.	Amount.	Number of Shares.	Amount.
		£.		£.
E. C. Faithfull	5	250	76	5,700
Thomas Hankey	70	3,500	50	3,750
John Bleaden	10	500	10	750
W. A. Brown	15	750	15	1,125
C. S. Crowley	600	30,000	450	33,750
Joseph Thompson	25	1,250	25	1,875
R. Sutton, jun.	636	31,800	950	71,250
Hopper Banks	10	500	10	750
B. B. Williams	440	22,000	53	3,975
Thomas Daun	20	1,000	10	750
Thomas Neale	100	5,000	130	9,750
Sir Wm. Jolliffe, bart.	120	6,000	65	4,875
Thomas Goodall	20	1,000	550	41,250
John Harman	500	25,000	700	52,500
T. S. Robinson	120	6,000	345	25,875
William Cash	50	2,500	40	3,000
Lord Monson	30	1,500	30	2,250
Matthias Wilks	600	30,000	95	7,125
T. S. Cocks	25	1,250	165	12,375
R. S. Cahill	110	5,500	40	3,000
Carried forward	3,506	175,300	3,809	285,675

No. 20.
List of Subscribers on the old, as well as upon the new Deed, with the Sums subscribed by them.

NAMES.	OLD DEED.		NEW DEED.	
	Number of Shares.	Amount.	Number of Shares.	Amount.
		£.		£.
Brought over - -	3,506	175,300	3,809	285,675
W. A. Hankey - - - -	25	1,250	25	1,875
Edward Owen - - - -	220	11,000	50	3,750
J. A. Hankey - - - -	40	2,000	20	1,500
Thomas A. Hankey - - -	40	2,000	20	1,500
James Swaby - - - -	200	10,000	490	36,750
James West - - - - -	35	1,750	10	750
A. A. Hankey - - - -	30	1,500	10	750
James West, jun. - - - -	10	500	130	9,750
B. Davis - - - - -	200	10,000	380	28,500
M. B. Rennie - - - -	100	5,000	125	9,375
James Rennie - - - -	100	5,000	125	9,375
S. W. Bennett - - - -	5	250	5	375
James Lipscombe - - - -	5	250	5	375
J. Langridge - - - -	50	2,500	25	1,875
John Patching - - - -	20	1,000	15	1,125
John Good - - - - -	20	1,000	10	750
John Hilton - - - - -	25	1,250	10	750
George Mathews - - - -	5	250	5	375
Francis Brown - - - -	10	500	35	2,625
Richard Heaviside - - -	162	8,100	70	5,250
W. D. Savage - - - -	6	300	10	750
A. Clifton - - - - -	20	1,000	20	1,500
Paul Hewit - - - - -	10	500	10	750
Wm. Wilton - - - - -	40	2,000	14	1,050
Thomas Dicher - - - -	15	750	5	375
John Robertson - - - -	565	28,250	150	11,250
J. S. Smith - - - - -	25	1,250	150	11,250
George Edmonds - - - -	10	500	75	5,625
Wm. Hanham - - - -	125	6,250	150	11,250
J. B. Wilks - - - - -	700	35,000	447	33,525
Subscribers, 50.	6,324	316,200	6,405	480,375

Appendix, No. 21.

No. 21.
Shares declared null and void, by default of Holders, on 18 Jan. 1837.

STATEMENT as to the SHARES declared to be null and void, by Default of the Holders, on 18 January 1837.

Total number of Shares - - - - - - - - - -		16,000
Deduct for original Shares not issued - - - - - - - -		15
		15,985
New Shares signed for on the 18th January 1837, inclusive - - - -		10,659
Leaving Shares unsigned for on the 18th January - - - - -		5,326
Special cases were afterwards admitted of parties who signed the Deed and paid the Deposit, amounting to - - - - - -	£. 2,023	
And there is a special case of William Lindon, who paid the Deposit before the 18th January, but has not yet signed the Deed, or taken the new Scrip - - - - - - - - - -	50	
And there is another special case of Charles Bellingham, who paid the Deposit since the 18th January, and lodged the white Scrip, but who has not signed the Deed, or taken the blue Scrip - - - -	70	
		2,143
Leaving the number of Shares forfeited by default of the Holders - -		3,183
Of this number the Directors have signed for and paid the Deposit upon -		2,150
Leaving 1,033 Shares forfeited and unappropriated by the Directors at the present time - - - - - - - - - - - - -		1,033
Add to this 15 original Shares which were never issued - - - -		15
		1,048

Appendix, No. 22.

ADVERTISEMENT, 9 Nov. 1836.

No. 22.
Advertisement,
9 Nov. 1836.

NOTICE is hereby given, that for the convenience of shareholders residing in the North of England, the Parliamentary Contract and Subscribers' Agreement in this undertaking will lie for signature at the Neptune Hotel, Liverpool, on Monday next, the 14th instant, and at the Moseley Arms Hotel, at Manchester, on Tuesday next, the 15th instant, between the hours of ten in the morning and five in the evening of those days, at which places the call of 1 *l.* per share can be paid and the deeds executed, and the person who will attend is authorized to receive and give receipts for the same.

H. Dean, Secretary.

3, Chapel-place, Poultry, London,
9 November 1836.

SIXTH REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

RAILWAY SUBSCRIPTION LISTS;

TOGETHER WITH THE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

South-Eastern Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
14 *July* 1837.

Mercurii, 22° die Februarii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the matters of several Petitions, complaining of the Names of certain needy and indigent Persons having been inserted in the Subscription Lists of several Railways, and praying for Inquiry into the Case of the Deptford and Dover Railway Subscription List; and to whom several Petitions containing similar allegations were particularly referred.

Martis, 1° die Martii, 1837.

A Committee was nominated of,—

Mr. Warburton.
Mr. Dugdale.
Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Aaron Chapman.
Mr. Charles Lushington.
Sir Eardley Wilmot.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. John Young.
Mr. Daniel Gaskell.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. George Evans.

Ordered, THAT the said Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers and Records.

Ordered, THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Mercurii, 19° die Aprilis, 1837.

Order [1st March] that Five be the Quorum of the Committee, read, and discharged.

Ordered, THAT Three be the Quorum of the said Committee.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to report their Opinion, together with the Minutes of the Evidence taken before them, from time to time, to The House.

Veneris, 21° die Aprilis, 1837.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Dugdale, Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. John Young and Mr. George Evans be discharged from further attendance; and that Mr. Chalmers be added to the Committee.

THE REPORT - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - p. 1
APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - p. 17

SIXTH REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE to whom have been referred sundry Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contracts of certain Railway Companies, and, among these, the following Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contract of the South-eastern Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company; viz.

1st. That of certain Members of the Provisional Committee for making a Railroad from London to Brighton on the Line called Stephenson's Line; showing, that whereas the Moiety of the estimated Expense of the said South-eastern Line is 600,000 *l.*, the amount of Subscriptions in the Contract deposited in the Private Bill Office is 607,650 *l.*, exceeding only by 7,650 *l.* the Moiety of the Estimate: that the Petitioners believe that a George Inall, who is entered on the said Contract as a subscriber for 30,000 *l.*, and who is a copying clerk in the office of Messrs. Currie & Woodgate, solicitors, has signed the said Contract, not on his own account, but on account of some other person or persons, and at the request and with the concurrence of and upon some understanding with the said Messrs. Currie & Woodgate: that after diligent inquiries for the undermentioned persons, who are entered as subscribers on the said Contract, they have been unable to find them; namely,

Frederick Brome, Albany-street, gentleman, 300 shares, 15,000 *l.*
Robert Henry, Pentonville, gentleman, 100 shares, 5,000 *l.*
V. Gerald, 15, Elder-street, gentleman, 10 shares, 500 *l.*

That deducting the amount of the said subscriptions from the total amount in the copy of the Subscription Contract deposited in the Private Bill Office, much less than a moiety of the capital required for the Undertaking will appear to have been subscribed: that the Petitioners believe that various other persons have signed the said Contract who are unable to pay the sums for which they have respectively signed, and that some such Subscribers have been induced to sign in consideration of money paid to them; and praying The House to cause these matters to be inquired into:

2d. That of the Directors of the South-eastern Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company, denying the Allegations contained in the said above first-mentioned Petition, and praying that inquiry may be instituted touching the said Allegations, and that they may be heard by themselves, their Counsel, &c. before the Committee appointed to conduct the inquiry:

And who were empowered to report their Observations, together with the MINUTES OF EVIDENCE taken before them, from time to time, to The House;——HAVE taken Evidence on the Matters adverted to in the said Petitions, or having reference thereto, and have heard the observations

made on such Evidence by the Counsel for the Petitioners above mentioned; and after considering the whole of the Premises, have agreed to the following REPORT:

THE project for the formation of a Company to obtain an Act for making a Line of Railway, to be called the South-eastern Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway, from the South-eastern Dover Railway between Croydon and Godstone to Brighton, with a Branch to Lewes and Newhaven, was set on foot in the year 1836. It appears to have originated with proprietors and other parties interested in the South-eastern Dover Railway. The estimated expense of the Undertaking was 1,200,000 *l.*, which it was proposed to raise in 24,000 shares of 50 *l.* each, the deposit being 2 *l.* per share.

21279.

21497.

21498.

The public were never invited to send in any applications for shares, but a circular was addressed by Mr. John Sebastian Yeats, the Secretary of the South-eastern Dover Line, to all the registered proprietors of that incorporated Railway Company; and a certain number of shares were reserved for them in the first instance. From 25,000 to 26,000 shares were applied for. Mr. Yeats was the person employed to make inquiries concerning the circumstances of the applicants. Use was made on this occasion of black lists, which parties were paid for furnishing, and the Secretary was also supplied by four other companies with the names of the parties to whom they had refused shares. Mr. Yeats, in addition to this information, had the advantage of the experience he had acquired in allotting the shares for a large Company in 1835. He then divided London into 10 districts, and employed a person in each district to ascertain the circumstances of the applicants. The allotments were all dated the 15th December 1836. They were made to persons whom he believed at the time to be all respectable and solvent. Wherever even the slightest doubt occurred as to the respectability of any applicant, the allotment of shares was limited to a very small amount. One third of the shares were reserved for future allotment. The allotments of those parties who omitted to pay their deposits on the day fixed for payment, were cancelled, and new allotments were then made to new parties. Except in the cases to be noticed in the sequel, none but allottees of shares were allowed to sign the Deed; and four bearers of bankers' receipts for the payment of the deposits on allotted shares, who were not themselves the allottees, were refused permission to sign. Minors also were not permitted to sign, of which Mr. Yeats gives an instance in the case of a youth 20 years old named Edward Piercy: a subscription to the Deed, however, occurs under that name for five shares, 250 *l.*

21497.

21401. 21416.

21452.

21414.

21400.

21240.

21404.

21405. 21456.

21457. 21459.

21163. 21265.

The amount of subscriptions attached to the Deed on the 2d of February, the day on which the copy of it was lodged in the Private Bill Office, was 607,650 *l.*

With the exception of one case, the only ground upon which objection has been raised to any of these subscriptions is, that the subscribers, not being themselves beneficially interested in the shares which stand in the Deed against their several names, have signed for others who are the parties really interested: in most cases, not stating that fact on the Deed itself; in one case, signing as though under procuration, but not under the authority of a power of attorney.

The subscriptions objected to are those of

1. George Inall, Islington, gentleman, 600 shares, 30,000 *l.*
2. William Clark, Seymour-street, gentleman, 500 shares, 25,000 *l.*
3. Frederick Brome, Albany-street, gentleman, 300 shares, 15,000 *l.*

4. Thomas

4. Thomas Rogers, Addison-road, Kensington, gentleman, 500 shares, 25,000 *l.*
5. James Henry Duffell, Homerton, gentleman, 50 shares, 2,500 *l.*
6. James Malley, Abbey-street, Dublin, gentleman, per Alexander Wilson, 15 shares, 750 *l.*
7. V. Gerald, 15, Elder-street, gentleman, 10 shares, 500 *l.*

George Inall is, and was when he signed the Deed, a clerk to Messrs. Currie & Woodgate, of Lincoln's Inn, who, jointly with Messrs. Clutton & Fearon, were solicitors to this Company until the 2d of December last, when they retired. The 600 shares for which Mr. Inall signed had been allotted, it appears, to the Hon. Captain Maude, who was a client of Mr. Woodgate, on the application of Mr. Woodgate and a Mr. Blake of Cumberland-terrace, Regent's Park, a proctor in Doctors' Commons, who, on the first formation of the Company, was one of the provisional committee, but had ceased to be so when the Deed was executed. Inall presented himself to Mr. Yeats, on the 29th of December, with a bankers' receipt for the deposits on the shares, and a note addressed to Mr. Yeats by Mr. Woodgate, stating that the bearer, Mr. Inall, would take up the shares for which Captain Maude had subscribed for himself and friends, and sign the Parliamentary and Subscribers' Deeds. Upon Inall expressing a wish to sign as for Captain Maude, Mr. Yeats said that that would be a bad signature, and that he must sign it in his own name. Mr. Inall states that he signed for Woodgate and Blake; and Mr. Yeats states that both these gentlemen have admitted to him, that the shares in question belonged to them jointly. Inall admits that he has no means of satisfying the responsibility of 30,000 *l.* within five years. Yeats states that he did not know who Inall was, but he presumed that Messrs. Currie & Woodgate would not introduce any improper person to sign the Deed: that, owing to the circumstance of their previous connexion with the Company and subsequent secession from it, he could not act towards them with that strictness that he would do towards the public. They had made a sacrifice of a lucrative situation by resigning the joint solicitorship, and on that account he was anxious to comply with their request, as far as he could do so consistently with his duty. William Clark, who is, and was when he signed the Deed, a clerk to Messrs. Currie & Woodgate at a salary of 75 *l.* a year, a subscriber on the Deed for 25,000 *l.* At an early period of the formation of the Company, long before any shares were allotted, it was arranged that Messrs. Currie & Woodgate were to have 500 shares each. The shares for which Clark signed had been allotted to Mr. Woodgate. On the 9th of January 1837 Clark presented a letter to Mr. Yeats, addressed to him by Mr. Woodgate, enclosing the bankers' receipt for the deposit on 500 shares, and containing the following passage: " I may as well now take up the shares for which I have subscribed for myself and friends. The bearer, Mr. Clark, who is interested in them with me, will sign the necessary deeds: enclosed is the receipt." On the production of that letter, Yeats permitted Clark, whom he did not at that time know to be in the office of Messrs. Currie & Woodgate, to sign the Deed. He allowed Clark to do so, from the same motives which induced him to permit Inall to sign. Frederick Brome, who is a subscriber on the Deed for 300 shares, 15,000 *l.*, at the time of his signing the Deed, was known to Mr. Yeats as the son of a general officer who lived at Woolwich for many years, and with whom Mr. Yeats was acquainted. Mr. Brome was at this time seeking a commission in the army, which he has since obtained. He was an acquaintance of Mr. Woodgate. The shares which he

21503.

21261. 21373. 21377, 21378. 21381.

21200.

21189, 21190. 21197.

21203.

21502. 21506.

21378. 21502. 21506.

21188. 21362. 21368.

21354. 21359.

21470, 21471.

21509. 21516.

21254.

21261.

21286.

21283. 21286. 21298. 21377.

signed for had been allotted, on the application of Mr. Woodgate, to John
21279. Allnutt, esq., a client and uncle of Mr. Woodgate. On the 5th of January
21279. Mr. Brome presented a letter to Mr. Yeats, addressed to him by Mr. Woodgate, containing the following passage: "The 300 shares subscribed for Mr. Allnutt, for himself and friends, he will now take up. The bearer, Mr. Brome, who is interested in the shares, will sign the Subscribers' Agreement and the Parliamentary Deed." Mr. Yeats permitted Mr. Brome to sign, directing him to do
21240. 21526. so in his own name, and to affix his real place of residence. Thomas Rogers, who is, and was when he signed, a clerk to Currie & Woodgate, is a subscriber
21261. on the Deed for 500 shares, 25,000 *l.*, which were the shares originally allotted
21234. to Mr. Currie. Rogers presented to Mr. Yeats the bankers' receipt, and a letter written to Yeats by Currie, requesting the delivery of Currie's shares to Rogers, the bearer, who, having an interest in them, would sign the Deed. Mr. Yeats
21236. permitted Rogers to sign, not knowing at the time that he was a clerk to Currie
21242. & Woodgate, but knowing that the shares for which he signed belonged to Woodgate. Yeats also knew, at the time that Clark signed, that the 500 shares for which he signed belonged to Currie. Mr. Yeats required Clark and Rogers,
21251. if they signed at all to sign in their own names, and not as for other parties; and informed them they would be responsible for the sums severally set against
21246. their names; he did not ask them what their occupations were, their circum-
21253. 21255. stances, and their means of meeting their engagements; he considered that the
21247. parties who had authorized them to sign would be equitably liable to the Com-
21263, 21264. pany for any loss that might arise. It was not until the lodgment in the Private
21467. 21479. Bill Office, late in February last, of the Subscription List of the Kent Railway, on which the names of Inall and Brome appeared as subscribers for large amounts, that the attention of Mr. Yeats was directed to the signatures which
21480. had been affixed at the instance of Messrs. Currie & Woodgate. He reported what he had observed in the Kent Railway List to the Board on the 25th or 26th of February, and by their direction on the 27th he wrote a letter to Mr. Woodgate, informing him, on the part of the Directors, that as they had reason to believe that the subscribers to the Parliamentary Deed introduced by him were not of sufficient responsibility, they were desirous that the Deed might be executed by those friends of his to whom shares were allotted on his application, as well as by himself and Mr. Currie, in respect of their own allotments. In answer to this application, Mr. Woodgate stated to Mr. Yeats, in reference to the 300 shares for which Mr. Brome had signed, that as Mr. Allnutt, between
21484. the period of allotment and that appointed for payment of the deposit, had
21485. declined to take the shares, he, Woodgate, was responsible for those shares, and
21477. the Company might hold him so in any way they could. To Mr. Yeats, about the end of March last, Mr. Currie stated that the 500 shares for which Rogers had signed were his; that he considered himself bound to the Company, and would, if the Directors required it, even sign the Deed himself, as conjointly with Rogers, or give a letter to that effect. The letter he wrote on the 27th of April stated merely that the name Thomas Rogers, signed to the list in question for 500 shares, was signed on Currie's behalf, and that Currie paid the deposit.

The subscriptions which were standing in January last on the Deed now under consideration, and on the Kent Railway Deed, in the names of Frederick Brome and of six clerks in the office of Messrs. Currie & Woodgate, and in which not the subscribers, but Messrs. Currie & Woodgate and two other parties were beneficially interested, are the following;

NAME.	South-Eastern Brighton Railway.	Kent Railway.	Total Amount subscribed by F. Brome and six Clerks.	Party beneficially interested, Mr. Woodgate.	Parties beneficially interested, Mr. Blake, Proctor, and Mr. Woodgate.	Party beneficially interested, Mr. Currie.	Party beneficially interested, Mr. Bell, Stockbroker.
Frederick Brome - - -	15,000	35,250	50,250	50,250			
Clerks of Messrs. Currie and Woodgate:							
George Inall - - -	30,000	10,000	40,000	- -	30,000	- -	10,000
William Clark - - -	25,000	- -	25,000	25,000			
Thomas Rogers - -	25,000	- -	25,000	- -	- -	25,000	
William Austin - -	- -	25,000	25,000	25,000			
Thomas Samuel Neville -	- -	25,000	25,000	- -	- -	25,000	
Edmund Charles Holland -	- -	12,000	12,000	12,000			
	95,000	107,250	202,250	112,250	30,000	50,000	10,000

Mr. James Henry Duffell is a clerk to Mr. Shewell, stockbroker, one of the Directors of the South-eastern Brighton Company. Mr. Shewell asked Duffell to sign for Mr. Mark Sprott, a gentleman of property in Roxburghshire, and a son-in-law to Mr. Shewell. This Duffell agreed to do, and signed for 50 shares on Mr. Sprott's behalf, telling Mr. Sampson, a clerk in the office of the Company, for whom it was that he was signing. 21307. 21310, 21311. 21538. 21540.

V. Gerald, as has been stated in Evidence given before Your Committee on the investigation of a former case, is a fictitious name assumed by William Algernon Lens Piercy. He applied in the name of V. Gerald for 35 shares, and received an allotment of 10 shares. On these he paid the deposit, for which a receipt was delivered to him, made out in the name of V. Gerald. On his presenting this receipt, and replying, in answer to a question, that his name was not V. Gerald, he was not permitted by Mr. Yeats to sign. Presenting himself the same day at the office of Clutton & Fearon, where another copy of the Deed was lying for signature, he signed, as he was allowed to do, and by the name of V. Gerald. 21420.

The moiety of the estimated expense is 600,000 *l.*; the sum subscribed to the Contract Deed on the day of the deposit was 607,650 *l.*; from which deducting 119,500 *l.* which is the amount of the subscriptions that appear not to be of a *bonâ fide* kind, there remains the sum of 488,150 *l.*, which is deficient by 111,850 *l.* of the sum required by the Standing Orders to have been subscribed; but as this Subscription List is one of those which have been included in the Consolidated List appended to the Bill for a Railroad from London to Brighton which has passed this House, the opinion expressed by Your Committee against the validity of the present List will have no effect on the interests of the subscribers to the South-eastern Brighton Railway.

14 *July* 1837.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Lunæ, 10° *die Julii*, 1837.

Present,

MR. WARBURTON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.

Report read, considered and agreed to.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Veneris, 2° die Junii, 1837.

Mr. James Sebastian Yeats - - - - - - - p. 1
Mr. George Inall - - - - - - - - - p. 15
Mr. James Henry Duffell - - - - - - - p. 16

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Veneris, 2° die Junii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. Thornley.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. Warburton.
Mr. C. Lushington.	

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

SOUTH-EASTERN, BRIGHTON, LEWES AND NEWHAVEN RAILWAY.

The Petition of William Crawshay was read.

The Petition of the Provincial Directors of the South Eastern, Brighton, &c., Railway, was read.

Mr. *James Sebastian Yeats*, called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *J. S. Yeats.*

2 June 1837.

21158. Mr. *Austin.*] ARE you the Secretary to the South Eastern and Dover Railway?—Yes.

21159. What was the name of your company before the Brighton Committee? The South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway.

21160. Were you the secretary to the company under this firm of the South Eastern Brighton Company?—Yes.

21161. What was the capital, or the estimated expense, of that railway, before you went before the Standing Orders' Committee?—£. 1,200,000.

21162. You are aware that it is necessary, by the Order of the House of Commons, before any petition is presented for a railway, that there should be a subscription, to the amount of one-half of the estimated expense, entered into in a certain manner?—Yes.

21163. What was the amount subscribed apparently in that manner, when you presented yourselves before the Standing Orders' Committee?—£. 607,650; that is upon the deed.

21164. I am asking you as to the Standing Order; the deed was signed for so much?—Yes.

21165. That is 7,650 *l.* above the half required?—Yes.

21166. Who were the solicitors to this company?—Messrs. Clutton & Fearon, and Messrs. Currie & Woodgate, up to a certain time.

21167. Up to what time?—The 2d of December 1836.

21168. Joint solicitors?—Yes.

21169. What took place on the 2d of December 1836?—Messrs. Currie & Woodgate retired.

21170. What is the date of the deed?—I think the 20th of December, long before the allotment of shares took place; the 14th of December is the date of the deed.

21171. What is the deed you are looking at?—The South Eastern Brighton deed.

21172. Is that the deed exhibited before the Committee?—No; this is the contract and subscribers' agreement both.

21173. Have you the Parliamentary contract there?—Yes, here are the four parts. [*The Witness produced the same.*]

21174. Does that bear the same date as the former one?—I think they bear the same date.

Mr. J. S. Yeats.

2 June 1837.

21175. *Chairman.*] And signed by the same parties?—Yes, they are signed in duplicate; the Parliamentary contract, No. 1, and the subscribers' agreement, No. 1, are signed by the same parties.

21176. And to the same amount?—No; the subscribers' agreement does not contain any amount.

21177. Mr. *Austin.*] That, you say, is the 14th of December?—Yes.

21178. Do you produce a deed containing the signature of George Inall?—Yes.

21179. What deed is it?—Deed No. 1. [*The Witness produced the Deed.*]

21180. Is that the deed No. 1 you referred to before?—They are all of the same date.

21181. Is that the one you referred to before?—Yes; I have only one deed No. 1; this is the deed.

21182. You hold the deed in your hand; are you the attesting witness to a considerable number of subscriptions?—A very large number.

21183. Are you the attesting witness to the signature of one George Inall?—Yes, I am.

21184. When did he sign?—[*The Witness referred to the Letter.*] On the 29th of December.

21185. Do you remember his coming to sign?—Yes.

21186. Did you know the man?—No.

21187. Were you aware he had signed the Deptford and Dover deed?—No, I did not know it until after that deed had been deposited in the Private Bill Office, and I had obtained a copy of the Deptford and Dover contract; it was late in February.

21188. Did you know who he was at the time he signed?—No.

21189. How did he present himself to you?—With an authority.

21190. *Chairman.*] What do you mean by an authority?—[*The Witness produced a Paper.*] This is a copy of it; I have got the original here, if it is wanted. [*The same was handed in.*]

21191. Had you read the Standing Orders to which I have formerly referred?—Most likely I had; I will not be positive whether I had or not; it is most probable I had.

21192. You had been secretary for the other line when it was passing through Parliament, the South Eastern and Dover?—Yes.

21193. You must have heard of that Order?—The Order has been in existence some years.

21194. That is not an answer; what I want to know is, whether you had not read that Standing Order?—I have no doubt that I had read it.

21195. At the time that Mr. Inall subscribed?—Long before that.

21196. You were acquainted with the purport of the Standing Order, and the intention of it; you were acquainted with the reason of it?—I was acquainted with it, but what the reason was upon which it was framed I do not know.

21197. You say Mr. Inall presented himself with the original of this document I hold in my hand.—Yes.

21198. Had you the deed in your custody?—Yes.

21199. Did he tender himself to sign the deed?—He did.

21200. Did he produce this authority before he signed the deed?—And the bankers' receipt.

21201. Did he produce that authority?—Yes.

21202. Did you read it?—Yes.

21203. After you read it, did you allow him to sign?—He wished to sign as for Captain Maude; I told him he could not sign the deed as for Captain Maude; that it would be a bad signature, and he must sign it in his own name.

21204. Did he tell you he was a clerk to Messrs. Currie & Woodgate?—No.

21205. You know he is such clerk now?—No, I do not.

21206. Have you never heard it since?—I have read it in the Report of the Deptford and Dover Committee.

[*The Document was read, as follows:*]

(Copy.) "To J. S. Yeats, Esq., 10, Coleman-street. Signed W. Woodgate.

"My dear Sir,—S E. B. The bearer, Mr. Inall, will take up the shares for which Captain Maude has subscribed for himself and friends, and will sign the Parliamentary

Parliamentary and subscribers' deeds. Captain M. is still in Wales. Yours very truly, *William Woodgate.*"

21207. That is signed by Currie & Woodgate?—Yes, one of that firm.

21208. *Chairman.*] He did not only wish to sign for Captain Maude, but for "Captain Maude and friends?"

21209. Mr. *Austin.*] Yes. It was in consequence of the production of that authority he was allowed to sign?—Yes.

21210. I must ask you again; is Mr. Inall a clerk in the office of Currie & Woodgate?—I have said before I do not know it, except from the Report of the Deptford and Dover Committee.

21211. Have you not heard it from Messrs. Currie & Woodgate?—No.

21212. You have received no letter or instructions from Messrs. Currie & Woodgate to that effect?—It is not within my knowledge; if it was, I should admit it.

The *Chairman* stated that it appeared distinctly in evidence before the Deptford and Dover Committee, that Inall was a clerk to Messrs. Currie & Woodgate.

21213. Mr. *Austin.*] You did admit him to sign it?—Yes.

21214. For how many shares?—Six hundred shares.

21215. What amount?—£.30,000.

21216. He described himself George Inall, gentleman, Islington; 600 shares, 30,000*l.*?—Yes, he did.

The evidence of Mr. William Woodgate, in reference to a person of the name of Inall, was read.

21217. You cannot tell us whether he is a clerk with Messrs. Currie & Woodgate?—I do not know it from my own knowledge.

21218. Do you know his circumstances only from the Report?—In no other way whatever.

21219. Do you remember a person of the name of Clark coming to sign the deed?—Yes, William Clark.

21220. Were you the attesting witness there?—Yes.

21221. Did he produce any paper?—Yes, he did.

21222. Let me look at it [*It was handed to Mr. Austin*]?—That is a copy of it.

21223. Have you got the originals?—Yes.

21224. Just let me look at them. [*They were handed to Mr. Austin.*]

21225. You have put a pencil-mark to say stop here, and I will stop here; the rest is not material. This is signed William Woodgate and addressed to the secretary, dated the 9th of January 1836, Lincoln's-inn?—It should be 1837; I received it in 1837.

21226. I will read all that is material to this question. "My dear Sir,—S. E. Brighton Railway. I may as well now take up the shares for which I have subscribed for myself and friends: the bearer, Mr. Clark, who is interested in them with me, will sign the necessary deeds; enclosed is the receipt." Upon the production of this paper, did you permit Mr. Clark to sign?—Yes, I did.

21227. For how much?—For 500 shares, 25,000*l.*

21228. He described himself as of Seymour-street, gentleman, did he not?—Yes, he did.

21229. Did you know at that time that William Clark was a clerk to Messrs. Currie & Woodgate?—No; nor do I know it now.

21230. Except in the way you have described?—No; I do not know that he is named in that Report.

21231. Did Thomas Rogers sign?—Yes.

21232. Did he produce a letter?—He did.

21233. Show it me. [*It was handed to Mr. Austin.*]

21234. This is signed "James Currie," and dated "Lincoln's-inn, 11th January 1837," and addressed to Mr. Yeats: "Sir,—I shall be obliged by your delivering to the bearer my shares in the South Eastern Brighton Railway, and he will, having an interest in them, sign the deed." Did Thomas Rogers sign the deed?—Yes, he did.

21235. As of Addison-road, Kensington, gentleman, 500 shares, 25,000*l.*?—Yes, he did.

Mr. *J. S. Yeats.*

2 June 1837.

21236. Did you know at that time he was a clerk of Messrs. Currie & Woodgate?—No, not at that time.

21237. When did you first learn that?—Yesterday.

21238. From whom?—From Mr. Currie.

21239. Did you see Mr. Currie about it?—He called upon me yesterday about it.

21240. You had a conversation with him upon the subject?—Yes; and he told me that Rogers was a clerk in his service.

21241. Did he tell you also that Inall was in his service, or William Clark?—No.

21242. Did you know at the time that Rogers and Clark signed, to whom the shares belonged?—Yes.

21243. Did you know how many belonged to Rogers, and how many to Clark?—No.

21244. You saw in the two letters you call an authority, that they are stated to be interested in the shares?—Yes.

21245. Did you ascertain the extent of their interest?—No.

21246. Did you permit them to sign for these large sums without putting that question to them?—I objected to their signing for those parties in that manner, and stated that they could only sign in their own names, and that they would be responsible for the sums put against their names.

21247. You told them that they would be responsible personally; that that was your opinion of the effect of the signature, and what you told them?—That was my opinion of the effect of the signature as regards them; but as to the effect of the letters under which they signed, I considered that the parties who had given them that authority were equitably liable to the company for any default that might arise.

21248. But you considered them responsible to the company by signing?—Yes; but that the other parties were not released.

21249. You told them that they were responsible?—Yes.

21250. You insisted upon their signing the deed?—I would not let them sign for another party.

21251. If they signed at all, they should sign in their own name, and not for other parties?—Yes.

21252. Also informing them that they would be responsible?—Yes, if they signed the deed.

21253. Did you thereupon make any inquiries as to their responsibility?—Not at that time.

21254. Did you ask them any questions?—Not at that time.

21255. You have not heard my question; did you ask them any questions what their circumstances were; their occupations or their means to meet their engagements?—I do not think I did.

21256. Did you ask them any questions?—I do not think I asked them any question, except when they put the question to me, what they were to put as their residence and designation; I asked them what they were, and then told them what to put.

21257. You told them, or they told you?—I asked them where they resided, and they told me where; I then told them to put down their residence and their designation in the same way.

21258. And the number of shares?—Yes.

21259. And the sums?—Yes, they producing to me the bankers' receipts in every case.

21260. Have you got the bankers' receipts?—Yes.

21261. Be so good as to produce them?—[*The Witness produced some Papers.*]—That is the one for which Rogers executed; this [*another paper*] is the one for which Mr. Clarke executed; and this [*another paper*] is Mr. Inall's.

[*The following Documents were delivered in*:]

"Deposit 2 *l.* per share on each 50 *l.* share, 600 shares, No. 20.

"London, Dec. 24, 1836. Received of Honourable Captain Maude, the sum of 1,200 *l.*, on account of the South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company.

"7,751/8,350, 29/12/36.—1,200 *l.* "For *Esdaile & Co., Geo. Scott.*"

"Deposit

Mr. *J. S. Yeats.*

2 June 1837.

" Deposit 2*l.* per share on each 50*l.* share, 500 shares, No. 284.

" London, Dec. 24, 1836. Received of William Woodgate, esq., the sum of 1,000*l.*, on account of the South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company.

" 10,001/10,500, 9/1/37.—1,000. " For *Esdaile & Co., Geo. Scott.*"

" Deposit 2*l.* per share on each 50*l.* share, 500 shares, No. 285, A.

" 24 December 1836. Received of Mr. James Currie, the sum of 1,000*l.*, on account of the South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company.

" 12,251/12,750, 11/1/37.—1,000*l.* " For *Esdaile & Co., T. S. Hintson.*"

21262. Inall's is, "Received of the Honourable Captain Maude," such a sum; the other is, " Received of Mr. James Currie;" which is Mr. Currie's, Rogers or Clark?—Rogers.

21263. And Mr. Woodgate's?—That which is signed by Clark, " Received of William Woodgate, esq."

21263*. When did you make inquiries as to the responsibility of these parties?—Almost immediately after I obtained from the Private Bill Office a copy of the Dover Subscription List.

21264. When was that?—Late in February; I think the deposit was made on the 13th or 14th, and as soon as I could get a copy of it, I went through the list, and there I discovered the names.

21265. At that time had your deed been lodged?—Yes; it was lodged, I think, the 2d or 3d of February.

21266. Had you passed the Standing Orders' Committee?—Yes, I believe we had; I will not be positive, but it was close upon February.

21267. What date in February did you pass that Committee?—I cannot charge my memory now; it was certainly after we had passed the Standing Orders' Committee; I was not examined before the Standing Orders' Committee, and cannot charge my memory as to the date.

21268. Did I understand you to say that you got a copy of that very list on the 14th?—No, it was deposited on the 14th, and as soon as I could get a copy, from the press of business in that office, I got one.

21269. When was it?—I cannot charge my memory; I think it was late in February; it must have been before the 27th of February.

21270. Have you anything to bring it to your recollection?—Yes.

21271. What is it?—A letter addressed by me to Mr. Woodgate.

21272. Did you or your company go before the Standing Orders' Committee upon the Deptford and Dover Line?—No.

21273. Did you take any steps to impede their progress?—No.

21274. Do you know under whose direction the petition againt the Deptford and Dover List was prosecuted before this Committee?—No, I do not.

21275. Your company had nothing to do with it?—Nothing whatever.

21276. Did Frederick Brome sign the deed in your presence?—Yes.

21277. Did he produce any document?—Yes, one.

21278. What was it?—Letter of authority to sign the deed on the 5th of January; the 4th or 5th; it was produced to me on the 5th; it is dated the 4th.

[*The same was handed to Mr. Austin.*]

21279. Mr. *Austin.*] This is signed W. Woodgate, addressed to Mr. Yeats, the 4th of January 1837. "My dear Sir—S. E. B. R. The 300 shares subscribed for Mr. Allnutt, for himself and friends, he will now take up. The bearer, Mr. Brome, who is interested in the shares, will sign the subscribers' agreement, and the Parliamentary deed." Have you got Allnutt's receipt there?—Yes, I have.

[*The same was delivered in, and is as follows:*]

" Deposit 2*l.* per share on each 50 shares, 300 shares, No. 26.

" London, December 24, 1836. Received of John Allnutt, esq., the sum of 600*l.* on account of the South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company.

" 9,001/9300,5/1/37.—600*l.* " For *Esdaile & Co., G. W. Scott.*"

21280. Did you direct Brome in like manner to sign in his own name?—Yes.

21281. He did sign " Frederick Brome, Albany-street, gentleman, 300 shares, 15,000*l.*"?—Yes.

21282. Did you make any inquiries with respect to the solvency of Mr. Brome,

Mr. J. S. Yeats.

2 June 1837.

or who he was?—No; I knew his father at Woolwich, and he asked me whether he should sign the deed as at Woolwich, where he was more generally known. I said, "Under no circumstances sign it at any other place than where you reside;" he said, "The receipt is Albany-street;" I said, "Give your present residence."

21283. Did you know what profession he was following?—I know he was seeking a commission in the army, which he has since obtained.

21284. Do you know how he had been occupied?—No.

21285. Did you know he had been engaged in an attorney's office?—I knew nothing of his pursuits at all.

21286. Except that he had been seeking this commission?—His father was a general officer at Woolwich many years.

21287. Did you suppose he was a person capable of paying 15,000 *l.*?—I did not give the subject any consideration.

21288. Suppose you had done so, should you have supposed him capable of paying 15,000 *l.*?—No, not in one sum.

21289. In any time?—Yes; as the calls might be required.

21290. Are you of that opinion still, from what you have learnt since, from your subsequent inquiries?—I have made no inquiries about him.

21291. Do you mean to say you think he can pay this sum of money?—Not at once.

21292. In any way whatever?—Under the operation of the Act; it depends upon the period over which the calls may extend.

21293. Over any given number of years?—I am not competent to speak to his circumstances.

21294. What is the time given in the Act for the work to be executed?—Five years.

21295. Are you of opinion, in five years, Brome can pay 15,000 *l.*?—I cannot say that he would, or that he would not.

21296. Do you believe he could?—I think, from his connexions, he might; I speak of him only from his connexions.

21297. From no inquiries?—No.

21298. What rank does he hold in the army?—An ensign.

21299. Did James Henry Duffell sign, you attesting the deed?—I attested his signature upon one occasion, not upon the second.

21300. He signs as of Homerton, gentleman, 25 shares, 1,250 *l.*?—Yes.

21301. What document did he produce?—The bankers' receipt, in his own name, according to the letter of allotment.

21302. At the second time what did he produce?—I did not attest his signature.

21303. Have you got the document he produced on the second occasion?—I do not know that I have.

21304. Have you found it?—No.

21305. The first was signed before you?—Yes.

21306. For himself?—Yes.

21307. Do you know what Mr. Duffell was?—Yes.

21308. What is he?—Clerk to Mr. Shewell.

21309. At the time he signed?—Yes.

21310. Is Mr. Shewell one of the directors of your company?—Yes, he is.

21311. What is he?—A stockbroker.

21312. And Mr. Duffell was his clerk?—Yes; and I believe a member of the house.

21313. Do you know whether or not Mr. Duffell has signed the Westminster-bridge contract?—No, I do not.

21314. Upon two occasions?—I do not know.

21315. For 11,000 *l.* or 12,000 *l.*?—I know nothing of it.

21316. Has he signed the Canterbury Railway Subscription List?—I have not got it here.

21317. Do you know it?—No, I do not; it is very likely he may have signed it; he is a South Eastern proprietor.

21318. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You are not asked what is likely, but what you know?—It is my own line of railway.

21319. Mr. *Austin.*] He signs as for himself?—Yes.

21320. Producing a receipt for himself?—Yes.

21321. What

21321. What others are there upon the list that signed in the same way that Rogers, Clark and Inall signed, producing receipts for other persons?—I know of none.

21322. Might I call your attention to a signature in page 2, which you will find, "P. P., James Malley, Alexander Wilson;" does that mean *per procurationem*?—Yes.

21323. Was James Malley the person that signed?—No; Alexander Wilson.

21324. Who was the procurator?—Wilson.

21325. Malley was the principal?—Yes.

21326. I also see Samuel Robert Heley, by John Field, jun., his attorney?—There was a power of attorney.

21327. Was there a power of attorney in Malley's case?—No, none.

21328. Just give me the document [*the Paper was handed in*]?—Mr. Malley was a member of the Irish bar, and was unable to come over and sign the deed, and said he should be over in May or June, and would sign it.

21329. Upon the production of this document you allowed him to sign for Mr. Malley?—Yes.

21330. You did not require him to sign in his own name?—No.

21331. What was the cause of the distinction you drew between him, Clark, Inall and Rogers?—I do not understand the question; they executed upon the authority of Woodgate & Currie.

21332. For Captain Maude and other parties interested?—Yes.

21333. And for Woodgate & Currie themselves, why did you not allow them to sign in the same manner as you did Wilson?—Because there was an undertaking on the part of Mr. Malley he would sign himself when he came to England, if necessary; and from the representation made to me, that Mr. Malley was a member of the bar in Ireland.

21334. "This is to authorize Alexander Wilson, of No. 80, Old Broad-street, in the city of London, gentleman, to sign the deed of settlement of the above company for me, and in my behalf, in respect of 15 shares allotted; and I hereby declare that such signing of my name for me may be construed, for all intents and purposes, as my act and deed. Given under my hand this 30th day of December 1836, James Malley. I expect to be in London in May or June, when I will in person execute said deed, if necessary; I therefore hope the directors will not impose the expense of a power of attorney, should the above authority not be sufficient." Was it in consequence of that letter you allowed this signature to be *per procurationem*?—Yes, I made him state it so upon the face of the deed.

21335. Because you saw Mr. Malley had stated in his letter he would execute the deed himself?—If necessary.

21336. Was that the reason?—Yes, it was.

21337. That was the reason?—Yes.

21338. And that was the reason of the different plan pursued by you in his case, and the case of Inall, Rogers and Clark?—Yes.

21339. Now that being so, were you of opinion that the principals of Rogers, Inall and Clark would not sign the deed?—Certainly not: I considered, if I had refused to allow those parties to sign, that the principals would have signed in each case.

21340. You considered that?—Yes, decidedly.

21341. Then I must trouble you for another reason for the course you pursued: you said, in the case of Mr. Malley, you permitted Wilson to sign because Malley had expressed a readiness to execute the deed himself; and you said that that was the reason why you allowed the signature to be made *per procurationem*?—Yes.

21342. That is so, is it?—Yes.

21343. Then I ask you whether or not you were of opinion that the other parties, for whom Inall, Rogers and Clark signed, would have executed the deed?—They executed in a different form altogether; I did not call upon them to execute as *per procurationem*.

21344. Would you have allowed that deed to be executed by them *per procurationem*?—No.

21345. You knew who the parties were, because the letters contained the names of the principals?—Yes.

21346. Will you be so good as to direct your attention to this: when you advert to the letter written by Mr. Currie, that was produced by the bearer

Mr. J. S. Yeats.

2 June 1837.

Rogers, in Rogers's case, you will find that the words are these: "I shall be obliged by your delivering to the bearer my shares in the South Eastern Brighton Railway, and he will, having an interest in them, sign the deed;" how do you account for your insisting upon his signing the deed in his own name in that case, and not in Mr. Currie's name, or *per procurationem* for Mr. Currie?—I did not consider this equivalent to a power by procuration.

21347. Is that the distinction?—There is a distinction between the two cases, as I alleged before.

21348. You have given me two different reasons; I wish you to recall them to your recollection, that you may explain them. At first you said your reason for pursuing a different course was, that in Malley's case you were assured he would sign the deed himself; and you assign now as a reason upon which you pursued a different course, that you did not consider this a letter of procuration; is it because you believed Mr. Malley would sign, or that you did not consider this a formal letter of procuration?—I did not consider it a formal letter of procuration in the first instance, and I refused to let the parties sign it; that is one reason, and Mr. Malley's letter came several days afterwards.

21349. I want to know your reason?—I have given it you.

21350. No; you have said you were satisfied that Mr. Malley would sign himself, and that was the reason you let it be signed in that way?—And the form of the letter.

21351. That was another reason?—As well.

21352. What was the reason that induced you not to do so in Mr. Currie's case?—I said I did not consider this such an authority as would allow me to suffer Rogers to execute the deed for Mr. Currie.

21353. Then the reason that actuated you in not letting Mr. Rogers sign for Mr. Currie was on account of the letter?—I considered, if I had not let Rogers sign the deed, Mr. Currie would have signed it immediately.

21354. Why did you not allow Rogers to sign the deed for Mr. Currie?—The circumstances were these: Messrs. Currie & Woodgate had been the solicitors in the early period of this company, jointly with Messrs. Fearon & Clutton, and they retired from the joint solicitorship, as I stated before, early in December 1836; an arrangement had been made very early in the formation of the company, that Messrs. Currie & Woodgate were to have 500 shares each, long before any allotment of shares took place; and I felt also, in reference to their particular case, having left the company and seceded from it altogether, that I could not act with that strictness towards them that I should do towards the public generally; and I did not hesitate, under those circumstances, to allow those parties to sign the deed under the forms in which they presented themselves, because I considered that they were each equitably liable under the terms of this letter.

21355. Now we seem to have a third reason; you say you conceived, owing to the circumstances of the case, you could not act with such strictness towards Currie & Woodgate as to the other subscribers; is that it?—Yes.

21356. What do you mean by not being able to act with that strictness?—I have stated the circumstances.

21357. I want to know the meaning of it?—In the execution of this deed I considered this letter as equitably binding the parties for whom they came, and I consider so now.

21358. I want to know what you mean by not being able to act with the same strictness?—In requesting them individually to come down to sign the deed when I had their authority for other parties to sign for them.

21359. I want to know what you found in the circumstances of the case that should have prevented you requiring them to sign the deed?—In connexion with the company, having ceased to belong to it at the time of the allotment of the shares.

21360. In what way did that operate upon your mind?—I am giving you the facts.

21361. You say, owing to the circumstances, you could not act with such strictness; you say the circumstances were, their connexion with the company, which had ceased; what could have induced you to have waived their signing the deed?—I say that and other circumstances.

21362. What were the other circumstances?—The presentation of a letter by the parties who came from them, coupled with the circumstances of their connexion with the company, induced me to waive a personal execution of the deed by

by the parties themselves; and I could not have supposed it possible that Messrs. Currie & Woodgate, under those circumstances, were introducing any improper persons on the face of this deed.

21363. Then is that the reason why you pursued a different course in their case to the case of Malley?—Yes.

21364. Is that the reason?—That, coupled with the circumstances I have previously related.

21365. What circumstances?—The whole circumstances.

21366. Give the Committee one answer, and containing all your reasons for pursuing a different course in the case of Malley and Currie & Woodgate?—I have given them already.

21367. Have the goodness to give them to me in one answer?—I must repeat the same thing; I cannot give them in the same words.

21368. There are two different courses pursued in these cases, and I wish to know the reason?—The reason in the case of Mr. Malley is, the presentation of a letter of a more formal character than that produced by the other parties, coupled with the circumstance of his expressing a readiness to execute the deed when he came to London in May or June this year. The other reasons with regard to Messrs. Currie & Woodgate are, in consequence of their connexion with the company in its early stage, and their subsequent retirement from the joint solicitorship, and from the fact of this letter not being of such a formal character as, I considered, would have justified me in allowing the parties to sign as *per procurationem*; and upon the presumption that Messrs. Currie & Woodgate were not introducing improper persons to execute these deeds.

21369. Do I understand you now, from the last part of your answer, to convey this understanding to the Committee, that you conceived Messrs. Inall, Rogers and Clark were, personally, responsible persons?—At that time.

21370. For the whole amount they subscribed?—That they executed the deed for.

21371. That they were responsible for the whole amount they subscribed?—At the time they executed.

21372. The question I ask you is this; did you, at the time when they presented themselves for the purpose of subscribing the deed, conceive that they were personally responsible?—Certainly; upon the faith of this letter of introduction, the authority to execute.

21373. What I mean is, did you consider they were capable of paying?—At that time, upon the faith of this letter, I did; I grounded my opinion more upon that circumstance than any other.

21374. I will just call your attention for a moment to Inall's letter; he presents a letter to take up the shares for Captain Maude and his friends, and not for Messrs. Woodgate & Currie?—Yes.

21375. The previous circumstances connected with Messrs. Currie & Woodgate's connexion with the company, had nothing to do with Mr. Maude?—No; Mr. Woodgate was the solicitor for Mr. Maude, and a letter of Mr. Woodgate's with reference to that matter, received somewhere about that time, states Captain Maude to be in Wales.

21376. And Mr. Allnutt?—Mr. Woodgate was the solicitor of Mr. Allnutt, and, I believe, the nephew of Mr. Allnutt.

21377. Did you extend the effect of those circumstances to the cases of Allnutt and Maude?—Mr. Maude's shares were applied for by Mr. Woodgate and Mr. Blake; and Mr. Allnutt's shares were applied for by Mr. Woodgate alone; and Mr. Woodgate and Mr. Blake have both admitted to me——

21378. *Chairman.*] Who is Mr. Blake?—A proctor of Doctors Commons, living in Cumberland-terrace, Regent's-park; Mr. Blake and Mr. Woodgate have both admitted to me that these shares of Captain Maude's were theirs jointly.

21379. Is Mr. Blake a director?—No.

21380. Was he a director?—He was never a director.

21381. Had he any connexion with the company?—In the early part of the company, he was one of the provisional committee.

21382. You know he was one of the provisional committee?—Yes, but not one of the directors; he ceased to be a member of the provisional committee when the deed was executed.

21383. Do you know Edward Howell, who has signed for 50 shares, 2,500*l.*?—Yes.

Mr. J. S. Yeats.

2 June 1837.

21384. Did you know him at the time he signed the deed?—Yes; I did not attest his signature.

21385. But you knew him at that time?—Yes.

21386. Who was he?—He has been for many years a clerk to Messrs. Clutton and Fearon.

21387. Your other solicitors?—The present solicitors to the company.

21388. And Michael Cooper?—Yes, I know him.

21389. Is he also a clerk in the office of Messrs. Clutton and Fearon?—Yes, and an admitted attorney.

21390. Is he a clerk also?—He is their managing Chancery clerk.

21391. What does he sign for?—Thirty-five shares.

21392. £.1,750?—Yes.

21393. Did he sign for himself?—I did not attest his signature; I do not know what he produced at the time he signed..

21394. You do not know how that was?—No.

21395. Have you got the bankers' receipts?—Yes, I can find them.

21396. Just let us see it [*The bankers' receipt was produced in the case of Howell.*] Have you got the other one?—Yes.

[*The Receipt in the case of Cooper was produced.*]

21397. I find you have allotted shares to Edward Howell and to Michael Cooper?—Shares were originally allotted to them at the time the allotment was generally made, but the original letters were not paid upon at that time; where the original letters are now, I do not know; they never came back to my possession.

21398. I perceive that the allotments in the case of Howell and Cooper bear date the 15th December 1836?—That is the duplicate.

21399. That is a correct copy of the allotment?—It is.

21400. Did all the allotments bear date the 15th of December?—All the letters were dated the 15th of December 1836.

21401. Were those allotments made after inquiries into the state of the circumstances of the applicants?—Yes.

21402. And, under those circumstances, you allotted these shares to Messrs. Howell and Cooper?—Yes.

21403. *Chairman.*] Were the parties who signed the deed the parties to whom the shares were originally allotted, or were the transferees of the parties to whom shares were originally allotted, allowed to sign the deeds?—These cases are each original allotments.

21404. I asked you a general question as to parties signing the deed?—Where the allotment was paid upon by the party in whose favour the allotment was made, those parties were, with the exception of the parties mentioned this morning, the parties executing the deed; when the allotment was not paid upon on the day fixed for the payment of the deposits, new allotments took place to new parties.

21405. You are going into new matter; I asked you whether the parties who signed the deed were the parties to whom the shares were originally allotted, or whether, in case those parties to whom shares were allotted, transferred their interest to other parties, those transferees were allowed to sign the deed?—No, they were not; there are three cases particularly to which I refer, where parties holding bankers' receipts presented themselves to execute the deed, and I refused to let them sign.

21406. Mr. *Austin.*] Do you know Mr. Gerald, who has signed?—No, I do not; I do not believe he signed the deed in my presence.

21407. " 15, Elder street, gentleman, 10 shares, 500*l.*?"—I do not know him.

21408. When did you read this printed petition which we are now considering?—I read it some few days after it was printed.

21409. Have any endeavours been made to find this Mr. Gerald?—I have sent down to inquire.

21410. Have you been able to find him?—No, not now.

21411. What do you mean by not now?—Not at the present moment; the person I saw there said that Mr. Gerald lived there in December last, and I had the letter of allotment sent to him in December last, according to that address, and here is his letter of application. [*The same were handed in.*]

21412. Where did you get this letter?—From the bankers.

21413. And you say you made inquiries in each particular case?—Yes.

21414. *Chairman.*]

21414. *Chairman.*] Whose duty was it to inquire into the pecuniary responsibility of applicants for shares?—Upon a former occasion, in the year 1835, I had the superintendence of the allotment of shares in a very large company, and at that time I divided the town into 10 districts, and I placed persons in each of these districts to ascertain the respectability of the parties who had made their applications for shares at that time; and from that list, and the returns made out, and the inquiries made with respect to the parties, as well as from inquiries in the particular cases, in this case the present allotment was made.

21415. You were the party?—I made the inquiry about the parties myself.

21416. You were the party to whom it was confided to make inquiries as to the pecuniary responsibility of applicants for shares?—Their respectability.

21417. Mr. *Austin.*] Did you make inquiries as to Mr. Gerald?—Yes, I did in October or November last.

21418. Of whom?—Of a person living in the house, No. 15, Elder-street, Spitalfields.

21419. Where he described himself as residing?—Yes.

21420. Did you ascertain anything from that party?—I saw a female, who told me that Mr. Gerald had lodged there several years, and that he was believed to be a respectable man. He had applied for 35 shares, and 10 were allotted to him; it was the object of the company, in making the allotment of shares, where there was the slightest doubt of the respectability of the parties, to limit to a very small extent the allotment of shares, unless they were perfectly satisfied.

21421. You say you found a woman there?—Yes.

21422. Was that person found by the party you sent to make inquiry yesterday?—No, I sent no one yesterday.

21423. Did you go yourself?—No.

21424. I thought you said you had made inquiry since you read the petition?—I have directed inquiries to be made.

21425. Was that woman discovered?—I do not know who she was; but she said he was living there in December last.

21426. Was that person found again when you made inquiries lately?—I do not know; I did not go.

21427. No answer was obtained upon those inquiries?—No further than there was a Mr. Gerald living there in December last, and he had gone away, and they did not know where he had removed.

21428. Have you not been able to discover him?—No, I did not prosecute the inquiry further.

21429. Do you know William Algernon Lens Piercy?—No; except as an applicant for shares.

21430. Do you happen to know whether he is the Mr. V. Gerald?—I know the person of neither of them.

21431. Did Piercy apply to you for shares?—Not in this company, but in another.

21432. What company?—The Dover Company.

21433. Have you got that application?—No, I have not.

21434. Did you ascertain who Piercy was?—No.

21435. Did he not write from 15, Elder-street?—No, not to the best of my recollection.

21436. Where did he write from?—From Bishopsgate-street I think it was; I am pretty sure that it was.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

21437. Did Piercy get any shares on that application?—Not any in the last year or the year before in the Dover.

21438. Let the Committee have all the particulars about this Gerald; do you recollect his application to sign the deed in Coleman-street?—Yes, there was one there.

21439. Were the officers of the company there at that time?—Yes.

21440. What did the person call himself that made that application?—The applicant; I did not know the name of the party who presented himself to sign the deed, but he was accompanied by a person of the name of Green.

21441. That is the Mr. Green we have heard so much of in this room?—Yes.

Mr. *J. S. Yeats.*

9 June 1837.

21442. Do you recollect what the applicant described himself to be?—He presented himself as holding the receipt of Mr. Gerald.

21443. Did he state that his name was or was not Gerald?—He called to sign his name for those shares: I asked him if his name was Gerald; he said "No," and I said he could not sign the deed.

21444. Will you explain to the Committee how the name of Gerald got upon the deed?—The parties left me and proceeded to the office of Messrs. Clutton & Fearon in the Temple.

21445. Was there a counterpart of that deed lying there to receive signatures?—Yes, there was; and the party also presented a circular letter that had been sent out to the parties who had paid the deposits, stating that the deed was lying at the offices in Coleman-street as well as at the offices of Clutton & Fearon.

21446. Were there more than one person together?—There were two; I do not know who presented themselves at the office of Messrs. Clutton & Fearon; I have been told by the person who attested the signature, that there were two.

21447. In the name of Gerald?—Yes.

21448. Was not that the day you refused to receive the signature?—Yes.

21449. Using a different name from the name given to you in Coleman-street?—Yes.

21450. Green was one of the gentlemen that presented themselves to you?—Yes.

21451. In addition to the inquiries you have made about Gerald, did you also find that his name was absent from the list well known by the name of the black list?—He was on none of the black lists I had purchased or made myself.

21452. In addition to the inquiries you have made of the respectability of the allottees, have you and the directors furnished yourselves with black lists, and means to provide yourselves with information as to the solveney of the parties?—Yes; and in addition to the lists we have purchased we have had the refusals of four other different companies, of the names of parties to whom shares have been refused.

21453. You had this bygone experience of four other companies?—Yes.

21454. Did you and the directors, in allotting the shares, act upon that experience you had so acquired, and allot them only to persons, in your full belief, respectable and solvent?—Decidedly.

21455. You say the allotments corresponded with the deed?—Yes.

21456. You say there were three instances where you refused?—Yes, I refused to allow the parties to execute the deed presenting themselves with receipts in the names of parties different from those who presented themselves to execute; there were four cases of that kind.

21457. Did you also refuse to allow persons who had the appearance of being minors, to execute the deed?—Yes, I did one particularly, of the name of Piercy.

21458. Nothing to say to this Mr. Algernon Piercy?—No, Edward Piercy.

21459. His appearance being that of a youth?—I challenged him as to his age; he said he was just turned of 20; and I said, "You cannot sign this deed."

21460. With respect to Edward Howell, you say he has been many years clerk to Messrs. Clutton and Fearon?—Yes.

21461. Do you not know he is a perfectly responsible man, and fully able to meet the demands upon him in respect of those shares?—From what I have known of him, I should say he was.

21462. Should you not say the same of Michael Cooper, the managing clerk of Clutton and Fearon?—Yes; I have no reason to doubt the responsibility of both of them.

21463. Do you not know that Mr. Cooper is an attorney, and in practice himself?—I know him to be an admitted attorney.

21464. With respect to Mr. Blake and Mr. Woodgate, who have admitted to you that Mr. Maude's shares were theirs, is Mr. Blake a man of sufficient means to satisfy all the demands against his name?—Mr. Blake has the reputation of being a very rich man.

21465. When I spoke of Mr. Green, I did not allude to the gentleman the secretary of the Deptford and Dover?—Mr. Green, who is described as of Aldersgate-street.

21466. A different person altogether from the Deptford and Dover Company? Yes, altogether.

21467. You

21467. You have told the Committee that at the time Inall, Clark and Rogers signed those deeds for Messrs. Currie & Woodgate, you thought they were responsible persons; had you any reason whatever to believe at that time they were not so?—None whatever; nor was my suspicion raised till I saw their names attached to the Deptford and Dover deed for large amounts, and then I set on foot an inquiry.

21468. In addition to not knowing they were not responsible men, were not you led to believe that they were so from the representations of Messrs. Currie & Woodgate?—Yes, or I should not have allowed them to sign.

21469. If you had thought that Messrs. Currie & Woodgate would have recommended improper persons to sign, would you have let them done so, even with all your anxiety to oblige them?—Certainly not.

21470. When you mentioned to Mr. Austin, you did not wish to be too strict with Messrs. Currie & Woodgate, on account of their connexion with the company; do you consider they have made a sacrifice of a lucrative situation, by resigning the joint solicitorship?—I do.

21471. Was it on that account you were anxious to comply with the request they made?—Yes, as far as I could consistently with my duty.

21472. Notwithstanding that anxiety, if you had had any suspicion that the parties were not responsibile, or that Allnutt and the other parties were not liable, would you have permitted them to sign the deed?—Most certainly not.

21473. Have you ever heard Mr. Currie make any declaration with respect to his responsibility upon these shares?—Yes, I have; I have a letter from him to that effect.

21474. In addition to the letter you have read, stating that they were interested with him, have you heard him say anything as to their holding the shares, and being responsible for them?—Yes.

21475. Give us an account of what he has said?—

Mr. *Austin* objected to the question, and stated that Messrs. Currie and Woodgate must be called.

Mr. *Alexander* was heard in answer to the objection.

The *Chairman* stated that the letter might be read, and then Mr. Currie might be called, if necessary.

21476. Have the goodness to read the letter?—I applied to Mr. Currie in the latter part of March respecting these shares, for which Rogers had executed the deed.

21477. *Chairman.*] What was the nature of your application?—Upon the subject of Rogers's execution of the deed for those shares; and he stated that the shares were his; that he considers himself bound to the company; and that, if we required it, he would even sign the deed himself as conjointly with Rogers, or he would give me a letter to that effect. I saw him again on the 7th of April, and he then promised to send that letter to me; and on the 27th I received a letter, of which this is a copy, addressed by Mr. Currie to me:

"Dear Sir,—With reference to our previous conversation, and that of the 7th instant, I beg to repeat that the name, 'Thomas Rogers,' signed to the subscription list of the South Eastern, Brighton, &c. Railway, for 500 shares, was signed on my behalf, and the deposit was paid by me."

21478. Have you heard Mr. Woodgate state anything of that nature?—Yes.

21479. You say your attention was first directed to these signatures when you saw the Deptford and Dover List?—Yes.

21480. The moment your attention was directed to it, you took measures to inquire into them, and to ascertain how they got upon the deed?—Yes, and reported it to the board on the 25th or 26th of February, and by their direction I sent this letter to Mr. Woodgate; this is dated the 27th of February, addressed by me to Mr. Woodgate:

"South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway.

"Dear Sir—I am instructed by the board to draw your attention to the subject of the shares which were allotted to yourself and your friends on your application, during the time you were one of the solicitors to this company. The directors, from very recent information, have reason to believe that the parties whom you have introduced

Mr. *J. S. Yeats.*

2 June 1837.

duced to them as subscribers on your and their behalf to the Parliamentary deeds, are not of sufficient responsibility; and the directors therefore request that you will apply to those of your friends to whom the shares were allotted, and that the deeds may be executed by the latter, as well as Mr. Currie and yourself in respect to your own allotment. This matter was, as you must be aware, conducted entirely as one of confidence in yourself; and the directors therefore feel bound to call on you to place them, with reference to these shares, in the proper situation. The board have preferred to make this personal application to you rather than to address the individuals to whom the shares were originally allotted, and on whose behalf you were acting."

21481. That was a letter that eventually produced the letter you have just read?—As far as Mr. Currie was concerned. On the following day I received a letter from Mr. Woodgate in these terms, dated the 28th of February 1837: "I read your note of last evening hastily, and by accident put it on the fire instead of a circular which happened to be on my table. Oblige me with a copy, as I cannot remember the terms of it."

21482. *Chairman.*] Was there any further letter from Mr. Woodgate?—Yes, I sent a duplicate, and then this letter came in reply: "I have read the copy of yours of the 27th ultimo, and really do not understand it: when you are coming this way, perhaps you will look in."

21483. Mr. *Alexander.*] Then you saw Mr. Woodgate?—Yes.

21484. Tell us what took place?—He stated to me, in reference to Mr. Allnutt's shares, that Mr. Allnutt had, between the period of the allotment and the payment of the deposit, declined to take those shares; that was communicated by Mr. Allnutt to Mr. Woodgate; he said he felt, as he had introduced the name of Allnutt, he was bound to pay the deposit, and he paid the deposit.

21485. Was it upon that occasion, or any other, he stated his own responsibility for the shares?—At that time he said, "I am responsible for those shares, and the company may hold me so in any way they can."

21486. Excepting in those cases that have been mentioned, Allnutt, Captain Maude, Woodgate & Currie, is there one single instance in which you have permitted the deeds to be signed by persons you did not know or believe to be *bonâ fide* possessors of or interested in shares?—No; none, except Mr. Malley.

21487. That was by procuration?—Yes.

21488. Would you have allowed it in these instances if you had not believed and felt that those persons were equitably liable, though the signatures of other persons were attached?—No.

21489. Was your belief of their being actually liable strengthened by the high professional respectability of Messrs. Currie & Woodgate?—Yes, it was a letter of that description coming from them as solicitors; I considered they were fully aware they were not doing any act that they would not be justified in doing.

21490. You have been asked with respect to Duffell; you say he was clerk to Mr. Shewell, and a member of the Stock Exchange himself?—I have always understood him to be so.

21491. Do you not believe him to be responsible for the sum against his name?—Yes, I do.

21492. Mr. *Austin.*] Did he sign it for himself?—In both cases, I believe, for himself.

21493. Mr. *Alexander.*] In that case which you witnessed, he signed for himself?—Yes.

21494. Mr. *Austin.*] Have you got the receipt?—Yes. [*The same was handed in.*]

21495. Mr. *Alexander.*] Was there any anxiety manifested by the directors or the officers of the company to procure signatures to this deed unduly?—None whatever.

21496. On the contrary, were not there a large number of shares withheld by them instead of being issued?—Yes, nearly one-third.

21497. *Chairman.*] Have you stated the number of shares applied for?—Between 25,000 and 26,000; but the company never invited the public to send in any applications for shares at all.

21498. There was no puff direct or indirect to induce the public to take shares in the company?—No; a circular was sent out to all the registered proprietors in the

the South Eastern Dover Line, and a certain number of shares were set apart for them, in the first instance.

Mr. *J. S. Yeats.*

2 June 1837.

Re-examined by Mr. *Austin.*

21499. You say you made application to Messrs. Woodgate & Currie in the month of March, you have stated that?—Yes.

21500. What was the reason that induced you to do so?—The reason that induced me to report to the board the circumstances upon which it was attended, was my observing the names of Clarke and Inall upon the face of the Deptford and Dover deed, and Mr. Brome's; that was about a month, or more than a month, after the signature of the deed by these parties.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *George Inall,* called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *George Inall.*

21501. Mr. *Austin.*] DID you sign the South Eastern Brighton deed?—I did.

21502. For whom did you sign?—For Mr. Woodgate and Mr. Blake.

21503. Who are you?—Clerk to Messrs. Currie & Woodgate.

21504. And were at that time?—Yes.

21505. Were you in a condition to pay 30,000*l.* within five years?—I should fancy not.

21506. It is quite out of the question, is it not?—I considered I was signing for Mr. Woodgate and Mr. Blake.

21507. You never supposed you were making yourself responsible?—If I was, I considered they would take the responsibility off my shoulders.

21508. You have no means of satisfying the responsibility?—No.

21509. Is Mr. Clark a clerk to the same persons, Messrs. Currie & Woodgate?—Yes, he is.

21510. Was he in a condition to sign for 25,000*l.* and pay the money?—I cannot say.

21511. Have you any doubt of it; you know the man, he is a fellow clerk of yours?—Yes.

21512. Is he worth 25,000*l.*?—I cannot say he is or is not. I should not think he was.

21513. Would it not be an absurd supposition?—I cannot say he was.

21514. Has he a greater salary than you?—No.

21515. Can you tell me what salary he has?—£.75 a year.

21516. A clerk in the office?—Yes.

21517. Do you know Mr. Brome?—I did know him.

21518. Who was he?—A friend of Mr. Woodgate's.

21519. Did he occasionally write in the office?—I never knew him sit down to write in the office; he was backwards and forwards there.

21520. Doing what?—He attended for Mr. Woodgate, some matters in the House of Commons.

21521. As an assistant?—I do not know.

21522. How was he paid?—I do not know that he was paid at all; I never considered him a clerk in the office.

21523. Not a regular clerk?—No; I always looked upon him as the friend of Mr. Woodgate.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

21524. You considered that Mr. Woodgate and Mr. Blake would take all the responsibility upon themselves?—Yes.

21525. They are persons able to do so in point of substance and property?—Yes.

21526. And honourable to keep their engagements?—Yes, I have no doubt of it.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Alexander* admitted that Mr. Rogers was a clerk to Messrs. Currie & Woodgate.

Mr. *James Henry Duffell*, called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *J. H. Duffell.*

2 June 1837.

21527. Mr. *Austin.*] DID you sign the South Eastern Brighton deed?—Yes.

21528. Upon two occasions?—Yes.

21529. Whom did you see when you signed the deed?—I rather think, a Mr. Sampson.

21530. When you signed for 25 shares?—Yes.

21531. Describing yourself as of Homerton, gentleman?—Yes, those are my own.

21532. Did you sign again?—Yes, for Mark Sprott.

21533. Whom did you see upon that occasion?—I think the same gentleman.

21534. Do you mean that the same gentleman saw you sign both times?—I believe so.

21535. What did you sign for the first time?—The 1,250 *l.* was for myself.

21536. Was it the 50 shares you signed for Mr. Sprott?—Yes.

21537. Those you signed for Mr. Sprott?—Yes.

21538. Did he request you to do it?—He is the son-in-law of Mr. Shewell, and Mr. Shewell has a power of attorney for him, and he asked me to sign for his son-in-law, Mr. Sprott.

21539. Mr. Shewell, the director of the company?—Yes.

21540. Did you tell that to Mr. Sampson?—I told him I was signing for Mark Sprott.

21541. Whoever it was, you told him that?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

21542. Who is Mr. Sprott, in point of substance and property?—I believe he is a very rich man.

21543. Do you not believe him to be a man of great wealth?—Yes.

21544. He lives in Scotland?—In Roxburghshire.

21545. Perfectly competent to meet any demand to be made upon him by the company?—Yes, more than a hundred times as much.

21546. And a gentleman of honour to meet his engagements?—There is no doubt about it, I believe; he is perfectly independent of any business.

21547. You are aware of your responsibility in signing for him?—I did not consider I incurred any responsibility; Mr. Shewell guaranteed me.

21548. Mr. Shewell is a man of respectability?—Yes.

21549. The other shares are your own?—Yes, they are now in my desk.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Austin* was heard to comment upon the evidence which had been adduced in support of the petition.

Mr. *Alexander* was heard on behalf of the South Eastern and Brighton Company.

[Adjourned to Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

APPENDIX.

SOUTH-EASTERN, BRIGHTON, LEWES AND NEWHAVEN RAILWAY.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

No. 1.—Petition of William Crawshay and Adam Gordon - - - - - p. 17
No. 2.—Petition of the Directors - - - - - - - - - p. 18
No. 3.—Parliamentary Contract - - - - - - - - - p. 19
No. 4.—Subscribers' Agreement - - - - - - - - p. 20
No. 5.—List of Subscribers - - - - - - - - - - p. 22

Appendix, No. 1.

PETITION of *William Crawshay* and *Adam Gordon*.—5 May 1837.

No. 1. Petition of William Crawshay and Adam Gordon.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Members of a Provisional Committee for making a Railroad from London to Brighton, on the Line called Stephenson's Line,

Sheweth,

That your petitioners are interested in the success of a Bill now pending before your Honourable House, for making a railway to join the London and Southampton Railway at Wimbledon, and to form a communication between London and Brighton by way of Shoreham, on a line called Stephenson's Line.

That a Bill is also now in progress before your Honourable House for making a railway from the South-Eastern Railway to Brighton, with branches to Lewes and Newhaven, called the South-Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway.

That one of the Standing Orders of your Honourable House is, "That before any petition is presented to the House for a Bill for making any railway, a subscription to the amount of one half, at least, of the estimated expense shall be entered into by persons binding themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, for the payment of the money so subscribed."

That it appears by the estimate deposited by the engineer of the said South-Eastern, Brighton, Lewes, and Newhaven Railway in the Private Bill Office, that the estimated expense of the said undertaking is 1,200,000 *l.*, and that the amount subscribed, by the subscription contract deposited in the Private Bill Office, appears to be 607,650 *l.*, being 7,000 *l.* only beyond the one half of the estimate.

That there appears among other subscribers to the said subscription list, the name of George Inall, who describes himself of Islington, gentleman, and who has subscribed for the sum of 30,000 *l.*; that your petitioners have made most diligent inquiry for the said George Inall, at Islington aforesaid, but that no such person is to be found there.

That your petitioners have discovered that a George Inall is a copying clerk in the office of Messrs. Currie and Woodgate, who, with Messrs. Clutton and Fearon, were the joint solicitors for the said South-Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Bill, and they believe the said George Inall is the person who signed the subscription contract; and if so, he is perfectly unable to pay the said sum of 30,000 *l.*; and the said George Inall is a subscriber to the Deptford and Dover Bill for 10,000 *l.*; and it appears, by the Report of the Select Committee on the Deptford and Dover Subscription List, that the said George Inall signed the said deed on behalf of a Mr. Bell, a stockbroker, in Cumberland-street, and not on his own account; and your petitioners believe that the said George Inall has signed the South-Eastern subscription contract, not on his own account, but on account of some other person or persons, and at the request, and with the concurrence of the said Messrs. Currie and Woodgate, and upon some understanding with them.

No. 1. Petition of William Crawshay and Adam Gordon.

That it appears by the Report of the said Committee on the Deptford and Dover Railway Subscription List, that several of the clerks of the said Messrs. Currie and Woodgate signed the subscription list for various sums of money, on account of the said Messrs. Currie and Woodgate, or one of them, or on account of some other person or persons.

That Frederick Brome appears on the said subscription list as a subscriber for the sum of 15,000 *l.*, and that he is also a subscriber on the list of the Deptford and Dover Railway for the sum of 35,250 *l.*; that he is described in the first-mentioned list as of Albany-street, gentleman, and in the second list, as of Woolwich, Kent; that your petitioners believe that both descriptions are given by one and the same person, the person mentioned in the Report of the Committee of your Honourable House in the Deptford and Dover Subscription List as a subscriber, not on his own account, but for the said Mr. Woodgate, the solicitor.

That your petitioners have been unable to find the said Frederick Brome in Albany-street aforesaid, after diligent inquiries for him.

That amongst other subscribers to the said undertaking, there appears the name of V. Gerald, 15, Elder-street, gentleman, a subscriber of 500 *l.*

That your petitioners have been unable to find any person of the name of Gerald residing in Elder-street aforesaid.

That amongst other subscribers there appears the name of William Clark, of Seymour-street, gentleman, as a subscriber for 25,000 *l.*; and also the name of Thomas Rogers, of Addison-street, Kensington, as a subscriber for 25,000 *l.*; and Robert Henry, of Pentonville, gentleman, a subscriber for 5,000 *l.*

That your petitioners have diligently endeavoured to find out the last above-named person at the place stated in the subscription list, but they have been unable, after the most diligent inquiries, to trace him.

That deducting the amount of subscriptions of the said several persons hereinbefore named, much less than one-half of the amount of the capital required for the said undertaking, according to the estimate, has been subscribed.

That the facts detailed in the said petition (more particularly with reference to the said George Inall and Frederick Brome) have only been known to your petitioners within the last few days, and since the Report of the Committee of the Deptford and Dover Railway Bill.

That your petitioners are informed, and believe, that various other persons have signed the said South-Eastern deed for considerable sums, who are not worthy the credit of your Honourable House for the sums for which they have respectively signed in support of the said undertaking, and that some such subscribers have been induced to sign the said deed by misrepresentation, or in consideration of money paid to them.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your Honourable House will be pleased to cause these frauds upon, and violation of the privileges of your Honourable House to be inquired into, and grant such relief in the premises as your Honourable House shall think proper.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 2.

No. 2. Petition of the Directors of the Brighton and Newhaven Railway.

PETITION of the Directors of the Brighton and Newhaven Railway.—9 May 1837.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Provisional Directors of the South-Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company

Sheweth,

That a petition has been presented to your Honourable House by certain of the promoters of the line of railway from London to Brighton called "Stephenson's Line," impugning the subscription list to the first-mentioned undertaking, in the prosecution of which your petitioners are engaged.

That your petitioners deny the allegations of the said petition.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray your Honourable House that inquiry may be instituted touching the allegations contained in the said petition, and that your petitioners may be at liberty to be heard before the Committee appointed to conduct such inquiry, by themselves, their counsel, agents and witnesses, in support of the allegations of this petition.

Appendix, No. 3.

PARLIAMENTARY CONTRACT.

No. 3. Parliamentary Contract.

THIS INDENTURE, made the 14th day of December 1836, between *George Beauclerc*, of Grosvenor-place, in the county of Middlesex, esq., *Henry Charles Dakeyne*, of Saint John's-wood, in the same county, esq., *Moses Asher Goldsmid*, of Gloucester-place, Portman-square, in the same county, esq., *Edmund Halswell*, of Old Brompton, in the county of Middlesex, esq., *John Shewell*, of York-place, Portman-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., and *Rees Goring Thomas*, of Lombard-street, in the city of London, banker, of the one part; and the several other persons whose names are hereunto subscribed and seals affixed, of the other part; witnesseth, that the said several parties hereto, each and every of them, for himself and herself, his and her heirs, executors and administrators, and so far only as relates to his, her or their acts, and to the extent only of the sum or amount in money set opposite to his or her name hereunder, and not further or otherwise, do hereby mutually and reciprocally covenant and declare, each and every of them, with and to the others and every of them, and particularly all the several parties hereto of the second part, do hereby severally in manner aforesaid covenant and declare with and to the parties hereto of the first part, their executors and administrators, in manner following; that is to say, that they the said several parties hereto, together with the several other persons who have or shall have set their names opposite and affixed their seals to three certain other indentures bearing even date, and of the same tenor, purport and effect herewith, have subscribed the several sums set opposite to their respective names for the purpose of making and establishing a railway, to be called "The South-Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway," or by such other name or names as may at any time hereafter be adopted by the directors engaged in promoting the establishment of such railway, the same to lead from the South-Eastern Railway to Brighton, with branches to Lewes and Newhaven, by such course, route or line, and through such parishes, townships or places, as have been respectively or shall be hereafter from time to time selected and approved of by the directors for the time being engaged in conducting and carrying into effect the said undertaking, and also with such other branches from the said main railway to any other towns or places or works lying at a distance, not exceeding twenty miles from the said main railway, by such courses, routes or lines respectively as may hereafter by such directors he deemed necessary or desirable, together with proper warehouses and other works, erections and conveniences thereto respectively appertaining, the same respectively to be constructed, established and conducted in such manner as shall be provided for by an Act or Acts of Parliament to be applied for in the next session of Parliament, or in case such Act or Acts shall not be applied for, or if applied for, shall not be obtained in the next session, then as shall or may be applied for and obtained in any subsequent session of Parliament, in which Act or Acts it is intended to introduce a clause to save harmless the several subscribers and proprietors of shares, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, from being liable in any event for any larger or other sum than shall be so respectively subscribed by each of them as aforesaid; and further, that they the said several persons parties hereto respectively, or their respective heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, shall and will well and truly pay or cause to be paid the amount subscribed by each of them respectively within five years from the date hereof, in such sums and at such places and times as until the passing of the said Act or Acts shall be required by the said directors for the time being engaged in conducting the said undertaking, and after the passing of such Act or Acts, as the directors or others authorized by the said Act or Acts shall direct or appoint; and further, that it shall be lawful for the directors for the time being engaged in conducting the said undertaking in their absolute discretion to fix upon and from time to time to alter and vary as well the points at which the said main railway and the several branches thereof shall commence and terminate, as the intermediate courses, routes or lines thereof respectively; and also from time to time to determine what branches shall be made therefrom, and to fix upon and from time to time to alter and vary the extent and situation of the warehouses and other works, erections and conveniences thereto respectively belonging, and to make or renew applications to Parliaments for all or any of such purposes from time to time as they in their discretion shall think proper, and to confine the application or applications to Parliament in the next or any future session to the main line or any portion or portions thereof, omitting or abandoning all or any of the branches, and deferring the application for the remainder, if any, of such main line, or for all or any of the branches, to a future session or sessions; and lastly, that in the event of such Act or Acts not being passed into a law, the said subscribing parties severally and respectively shall and will well and truly bear, pay, allow and discharge the expenses already incurred or hereafter to be incurred with reference to the said undertaking or any part thereof, and particularly all expenses of surveys and estimates, solicitors' charges and counsels' fees, and travelling expenses, and all costs and charges of every description incident or preparatory to the proposed undertaking or any part thereof, and to the application or applications to Parliament, such expenses, costs and charges to be computed and assessed rateably upon the amount of the shares or sums subscribed by each of the said several persons parties to these presents. In witness whereof the said parties to these presents have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

Appendix, No. 4.

SUBSCRIBERS' AGREEMENT.

No. 4. Subscribers' Agreement.

We, the several persons who have hereunto subscribed our names, being severally subscribers to an undertaking for making and constructing a railway or railways, to be called "The South-Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway," or by such other name or names as may from time to time be adopted by the directors for the time being engaged in promoting the said undertaking, do hereby recognise and acknowledge the following persons, and such of them as shall from time to time be willing to act as such, directors; viz. *George Beauclerc*, of Grosvenor-place, in the county of Middlesex, esq.; *Robert Willis Blencowe*, of the Hooke, near Chailey, in the county of Sussex, esq.; *Francis Scawen Blunt*, of Crabbett, near Worth, in the same county, esq.; *George Borradaile*, of the city of London, esq.; *James Burton*, of St. Leonard's-on-Sea, in the county of Sussex, esq.; *Henry Charles Dakeyne*, of St. John's Wood, esq.; *Moses Asher Goldsmid*, of Gloucester-place, in the county of Middlesex, esq.; *Burwood Godlee*, of Lewes, in the county of Sussex, esq.; *Russell Gray*, of Lewes aforesaid, esq.; *Edmund Halswell*, of Old Brompton, in the county of Middlesex, esq.; *Christopher Hodgson*, of Tunbridge Wells, a Colonel in the Honourable East India Company's Service; *John Watson Pringle*, a captain in the Royal Engineers; The Honourable *Frederick St. John*, of Chailey aforesaid, a general in His Majesty's army; *John Shewell*, of York-place, Portman-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq.; *Rees Goring Thomas*, of Lombard-street, in the city of London, banker; *George Teherne Thomas*, of Tooting, in the county of Surrey, esq., and *John Hornblow Turner*, of Clapham Common, in the county of Surrey, esq.: And moreover we do hereby, in furtherance of the said measure, and in addition to a certain deed or Parliamentary contract and engagement, bearing even date herewith, under our respective hands and seals, mutually and reciprocally engage, each and every of us for himself and herself, and for his and her heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and so far only as relates to his, her or their own acts, with and to the others, and every other of them, and also separately to and with the said directors, and with the directors for the time being of the said undertaking, that we severally, and our several and respective executors, administrators and assigns, shall and will faithfully conform to and abide by the several rules and regulations hereinafter contained for the management and conduct of the said undertaking, until an Act or Acts of Parliament shall be obtained for that purpose; viz.

First,—That the said directors, or any board or meeting thereof, constituted according to the provisions herein contained, shall have full and ample power for carrying all or any part of the said undertaking as described in the said Parliamentary contract into effect, and for that purpose to cause such surveys to be made or completed, and to obtain such estimates, and to make such contracts for surveys or estimates, and such arrangements and contracts with canal and railway proprietors, landowners and others, and generally to adopt all such measures as such board of directors, or the several committees of management, constituted and authorized for that purpose as hereinafter mentioned, may in their judgment consider necessary or expedient or may be advised to adopt, and particularly to apply for, and seek to obtain as early as may be, an Act or Acts of Parliament, with such enactments and provisions as they shall think most expedient for the establishment, promotion or advancement of the said undertaking, or any part or parts thereof.

Second,—That the majority of members at any meeting of a board of directors, such meeting consisting of not less than three members, shall bind all the members, whether present or absent; and the member presiding at any meeting of a board of directors shall, in case of equality of numbers, have a second or casting vote.

Third,—That the said board of directors shall have power from time to time to add to its number from among such subscribers to the undertaking as hold each twenty shares at the least, and to supply any vacancies that may occur in the board; and also to appoint committees of management in the various towns to or near which it is proposed to carry the said railway or railways, or elsewhere; and to delegate to such committees of management, and to any proportion of the members of such committees, such duties and powers as the said directors may from time to time think proper.

Fourth,—That the said directors shall have full power to appoint, employ, suspend or remove and re-appoint bankers, solicitors, engineers, surveyors, secretaries, clerks, agents, servants and workmen for the establishment, promotion or purposes of the said undertaking, and also if and as they shall think proper to appoint and remove any acting director or manager, directors or managers, and to pay and allow all such salaries and recompences for services or works, whether already rendered or done, or hereafter to be rendered or done, as the said directors shall think right; and also to apply all or any part of the monies which have been paid or shall be paid by way of deposit as hereinafter mentioned, in payment of all or any of such salaries or recompences as aforesaid, and of the expenses incurred or to be incurred in or about the obtaining of any such surveys or estimates as aforesaid, whether made

No. 4. Subscribers' Agreement.

made by order of or adopted by the said directors, or in or about or with reference to the soliciting or obtaining of an Act or Acts of Parliament as aforesaid, and all other costs, charges and expenses incident to the said undertaking, or which have been or may be incurred in respect or on account thereof, or preparatory or relating thereto, including the costs incurred or to be incurred in opposing any competing line or lines of railroad, and generally in such manner as the said directors shall consider most conducive to the advantageous establishment and promotion of the said undertaking.

Fifth,—That the directors shall have full power from time to time to make and establish all such bye-laws as they may think necessary or expedient for the good government of themselves and the committees.

Sixth,—That a capital not exceeding 1,200,000*l.*, shall be raised in shares of 50*l.* each, for all the purposes mentioned in the said Parliamentary contract, or such a proportion of the same capital shall be raised as the said directors shall think necessary, according to the estimates obtained or to be obtained by them for any portion of the said purposes.

Seventh,—That a deposit of 2*l.* per share shall be paid by each subscriber at the time of subscribing, but that no further deposit or sum shall be called for on account of expenses or otherwise until the proposed Act or Acts of Parliament shall be obtained.

Eighth,—That it shall be distinctly provided in such Act or Acts of Parliament that no call shall be made upon the subscribers to the said undertaking, or any of them, which shall exceed the sum of 5*l.* per share at any one time; and also that no more than six calls shall be made in any one year, and that there shall be an interval of not less than two months between every two calls.

Ninth,—That the directors shall be at liberty to procure the creation by the said proposed Act or Acts, or otherwise, of such powers or provisions as may authorize the uniting of this undertaking with the South-Eastern Railway Company, and the proprietors of the said several undertakings, either wholly or partially; and the delegation or transfer for that purpose to the directors of the South-Eastern Railway Company, either permanently or for a time, and upon such conditions as to the said directors mutually shall seem meet, of all or any of the powers created by this agreement, or by the Parliamentary contract and agreement hereinbefore mentioned; provided that no such union shall be effected or be authorized by the said Act or Acts, or otherwise be effected, without the previous consent, if given before the passing of such Act or Acts, of a majority of the subscribers to the said undertaking who shall have duly executed these presents, or some other indenture or indentures of the same tenor or effect herewith, or of their respective executors or administrators present at a meeting convened for this purpose by notices stating the object of such meeting, and inserted ten days at the least previously in two or more London daily newspapers, and one newspaper at the least published in the town of Brighton, at which meeting the holder or holders of each share shall be entitled to one vote in respect thereof; or if given after the passing of the said Act or Acts, without the consent of a majority of the registered proprietors for the time being of the said undertaking, present by themselves or by their proxies duly authorized according to such Act or Acts, at a meeting convened for this purpose by such notices, and with such conditions with respect to the votes of proprietors as may be prescribed by such Act or Acts. As witness the hands of the said parties, the 14th day of December in the year of our Lord 1836.

Appendix, No. 5.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

NAME.	ADDRESS.	DESIGNATION.	No. of Shares.	Amount.	Seal.	WITNESSES.
				£.		
George Beauclerc	Grosvenor-place	esquire	200	10,000	(L. S.)	Thomas Wood.
Henry Charles Dakeyne	St. John's Wood	ditto	215	10,750	—	
Moses Asher Goldsmid	Gloucester-place, Portman-square.	ditto	160	8,000	—	
John Hornblow Turner	Clapham Common	ditto	385	19,250	—	
John Shewell	York-place, Portman-square.	ditto	550	27,500	—	
John Watson Pringle	Panton-square	captain Royal Engineers.	100	5,000	—	
Edmund Halswell	Gore Lodge, Old Brompton	esquire	100	5,000	—	
Christopher Hodgson	Tunbridge Wells	colonel	100	5,000	—	
Thomas Blake	Cumberland-terrace, Regent's Park.	gentleman	600	30,000	—	
Henry Charles Moreton Dyer.	Devonshire-place House	esquire	200	10,000	—	
George Borradaile	Balham, Surrey	ditto	200	10,000	—	
Robert Willis Blencowe	Chailey	ditto	200	10,000	—	
Robert Clutton	Hartswood, Surrey	gentleman	25	1,250	—	
John Williams	Elm-grove	ditto	150	7,500	—	
Henry Revell Reynolds, junior.	5, New-square, Lincoln's-inn.	esquire	5	250	—	
Thomas Henry Bosworth.	Westerham	solicitor	55	2,750	—	J. S. Yeats.
Lionel Hill Thompson	15, College-street, Westminster.	gentleman	15	750	—	
Charles Stewart	28, Oriental-place, Brighton	ditto	50	2,500	—	
John D. M'Kenzie	Crown-court, Threadneedle-street.	ditto	30	1,500	—	
Robert Hand	East Sheen	esquire	25	1,250	—	
John Heath	11, Albemarle-street	gentleman	135	6,750	—	
Henry Moreton Dyer	Devonshire-place House	esquire	100	5,000	—	
Edward Piercy	3, Sun-row, Islington	picture retailer	5	250	—	
William Kingdom	Clifton	gentleman	50	2,500	—	J. E. Samson.
John Hawkshaw	Messrs. Cox & Co.	Royal Engineers	15	750	—	
Samuel Weatherley	5, Bridge-street	chemist	15	750	—	
William Paxton Jervis	Woking	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
Thomas Dann	Reigate	merchant	20	1,000	—	
James Henry Duffell	Homerton	gentleman	25	1,250	—	
Joseph Thompson	7, Old Change	merchant	25	1,250	—	
Augustus Goldsmid	35, Gloucester-place	gentleman	15	750	—	
George Roberts	183, Oxford-street	ditto	5	250	—	
William Wray	27, Mornington-crescent	ditto	15	750	—	
H. Towgood	18, Bernard-street	ditto	50	2,500	—	
William Reeves	50, Newington-causeway	watchmaker	2	100	—	
Andrew Gusti Flint	4, Adam-street	gentleman	10	500	—	
Robert Henry Pugh	58, Brick-lane, Old-street	brass manufacturer	15	750	—	
Charles Wood	4, Exchange-buildings	gentleman	10	500	—	
Charles Wood, jun.	ditto	ditto	5	250	—	
Robert Ash	5, Wellington-st., Southwark.	engraver	2	100	—	
Joseph Rusher	32, Aberdeen-place	gentleman	40	2,000	—	J. S. Yeats.
George Wallace	72, Gower-street	esquire	25	1,250	—	
Robert S. Wadeson	11, Austin-friars	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Henry Lewis Smale	Doctors' Commons	esquire	50	2,500	—	
John Mills	Bromley, Kent	lieutenant-colonel	20	1,000	—	
George Inall	Islington	gentleman	600	30,000	—	
Robert Bennett Thompson.	ditto	ditto	20	1,000	—	
John Clutton	Southwark	solicitor	25	1,250	—	
Pascoe St. Leger Grenfell.	Lombard-street	banker	50	2,500	—	
Moses Asher Goldsmid	Gloucester-place, Portman-square.	gentleman	40	2,000	—	
Philip Melvill	East India House	ditto	15	750	—	
Shuttleworth Bryant	7, Sweeting's-alley	ditto	25	1,250	—	
Russell Scott	6, Upper Stamford-street	coal merchant	85	4,250	—	

NAME.	ADDRESS.	DESIGNATION.	No. of Shares.	Amount.	Seal.	WITNESSES.
				£.		
John Stead	Rotherhithe	architect	5	250	(L. S.)	
George Cripps	Capel-court	gentleman	40	2,000	—	
Isaac Sillcock	Westbourn-green, Harrow-road.	- ditto	4	200	—	
Frederick Clifford Cherry.	Clapham	- ditto	20	1,000	—	
John Laurie	Sydenham	esquire	200	10,000	—	
Henry F. Richardson	Haileyford-place, Kennington.	- ditto	35	1,750	—	
Robert Caldwell Crafton	Croydon	chemist	5	250	—	
William Parry Richards	Wellington-street, Strand	merchant	20	1,000	—	
J. H. Ellis	Keppel-street	gentleman	25	1,250	—	
Henshaw S. Russell	3, Mitre-court Chambers, Temple.	solicitor	5	250	—	
Thomas Hole	238, Strand	fishmonger	5	250	—	
Thomas Deeble Dutton	East-street, Brighton, and Stone's End, Southwark.	bootmaker	20	1,000	—	J. S. Yeats.
Alexander George Milne, jun.	6, Southampton-st., Fitzroy-square.	merchant	15	750	—	
William Cory	11, Commercial-road, Lambeth.	coal-merchant	15	750	—	
John Elliott Drinkwater	26, Pall-mall	barrister	100	5,000	—	
Frederick Brome	Albany-street	gentleman	300	15,000	—	
Thomas Alexander	Edenbridge	timber-merchant	4	200	—	
R. B. Cunninghame	Adelphi	gentleman	30	1,500	—	
Robert Williams	Bishopsgate Church-yard	- ditto	10	500	—	
Thomas Blake	Doctors' Commons	L. L. D.	400	20,000	—	
William Binns Wood	48, Barbican	gold and silver refiner	75	3,750	—	
Edward Shewell Turner	- ditto	refiner	10	500	—	
John Field, jun.	11, Throgmorton-street	gentleman	30	1,500	—	J. E. Samson.
William Clark	Seymour-street	- ditto	500	25,000	—	J. S. Yeats.
Richard Kirkman Lane	29, Argyll-street	- ditto	100	5,000	—	- ditto.
Edgar Levell	Bethnal-green	- ditto	15	750	—	J. E. Samson.
John Relfe	4, Gracechurch-street	tea-dealer	35	1,750	—	
P. p. James Malley, Alexander Wilson.	Abbey-street, Dublin	gentleman	15	750	—	
Thomas Rogers	Addison-road, Kensington	- ditto	500	25,000	—	
Samuel Robert Healey, by his attorney, John Field, jun.	Liverpool	- ditto	70	3,500	—	
J. C. Todd	Union-place, Lambeth	- ditto	10	500	—	
George Hastings Heppell.	King William-street	accountant	15	750	—	
George Booth	Oxford, Lancaster	merchant	50	2,500	—	
Joseph Hadwin	Liverpool	tea-dealer	10	500	—	
Thomas Cooke	- ditto	broker	20	1,000	—	
Nathaniel Reyner	- ditto	- ditto	30	1,500	—	
Thomas Slattery	- ditto	merchant	25	1,250	—	
George Laing	- ditto	- ditto	30	1,500	—	
Ralph Leigh	Wigan	attorney at law	30	1,500	—	
Richard Hall	Liverpool	merchant	50	2,500	—	
John Sinclair	- ditto	- ditto	30	1,500	—	
John Latham	Waverton, near Liverpool	surgeon	10	500	—	
John Latham	- ditto	- ditto	5	250	—	
Thomas Court	Liverpool	- - secretary to Underwriters' Association.	10	500	—	J. S. Yeats.
John Henton	- ditto	flour-dealer	20	1,000	—	
William Okill	- ditto	broker	20	1,000	—	
Stephen White	- ditto	miller	15	750	—	
Thomas Hadfield	Warrington	cotton-spinner	15	750	—	
John H. Turner	Liverpool	merchant	50	2,500	—	
John Scott	- ditto	broker	20	1,000	—	
Rev. James Willows	- ditto	minister	10	500	—	
Laurence Kaye	- ditto	merchant	20	1,000	—	
Richard Kelbrick	- ditto	cotton-dealer	10	500	—	
Thomas Robinson Woolfield.	- ditto	jeweller	25	1,250	—	
Edward Parker	- ditto	merchant	20	1,000	—	
James Overend	- ditto	- ditto	20	1,000	—	
John Hartley Hind	- ditto	- ditto	20	1,000	—	
William Milner	- ditto	manufacturer	10	500	—	
John Wellstood	- ditto	merchant	20	1,000	—	
Peter Bretherton, jun.	- ditto	coach proprietor	100	5,000	—	

NAME.	ADDRESS.	DESIGNATION.	No. of Shares.	Amount.	Seal.	WITNESSES.
				£.		
William Carson	Liverpool	linendraper	20	1,000	(L. S.)	
Charles O'Kill	ditto	gentleman	20	1,000	—	
George Frederick Fairclough.	ditto	solicitor	15	750	—	
John S. Kewley	ditto	broker	10	500	—	
Israel Barned	ditto	banker	100	5,000	—	
Lewin Mozley	ditto	ditto	100	5,000	—	
Robert Wilding Bateson.	ditto	broker	20	1,000	—	
Daniel Campbell	ditto	merchant	10	500	—	
George Doncaster	ditto	ditto	15	750	—	
Matthew Wotherspoon	ditto	broker	10	500	—	
John Edward	ditto	upholsterer	25	1,250	—	
C. J. Townley	ditto	broker	40	2,000	—	
Robert Hector	ditto	surgeon	20	1,000	—	
William Cooke	ditto	watchmaker	20	1,000	—	
Chas. Lawrenson Pennington.	ditto	master mariner	30	1,500	—	
Margaret Anne Reynolds.	ditto	spinster	20	1,000	—	
David Macrorie	ditto	M. D.	40	2,000	—	
D. F. Atkinson	ditto	attorney at law	30	1,500	—	
Richard Hall	ditto	merchant	10	500	—	
Richard Rawson	ditto	broker	40	2,000	—	
David Black Sorley	ditto	ditto	30	1,500	—	
Thomas Hornby	ditto	commission agent	20	1,000	—	J. S. Yeats.
John Rice Hayward	ditto	broker	10	500	—	
Morris Lewis Samuel	ditto	merchant	50	2,500	—	
Thomas Cooke	ditto	broker	45	2,250	—	
Samuel Lacon	ditto	merchant	30	1,500	—	
Nicholas Duckenfield Bold.	ditto	ditto	80	4,000	—	
James Glynne Bateson	ditto	broker	20	1,000	—	
Thomas Townend	Manchester	merchant	50	2,500	—	
Thomas Cardwell	ditto	agent	10	500	—	
William Cardwell	ditto	ditto	5	250	—	
Jonathan Carr	ditto	sharebroker	30	1,500	—	
Alexander Leibert	ditto	merchant	50	2,500	—	
Lawrence Rostron	ditto	ditto	20	1,000	—	
Edward Cardwell	ditto	agent	5	250	—	
John Lynch	Chorley	coal-owner	40	2,000	—	
James Harrison, jun.	Manchester	merchant	50	2,500	—	
William Pipe	ditto	manufacturer	20	1,000	—	
John Walker	ditto	merchant	30	1,500	—	
James Bennett	ditto	corn-factor	20	1,000	—	
Richard Collins	ditto	corn-merchant	20	1,000	—	
Robert Henry Wilson	ditto	solicitor	75	3,750	—	
Robert Chapman Sharp	ditto	merchant	30	1,500	—	
Henry Houldsworth	ditto	spinner	20	1,000	—	
Richard H. Townend	ditto	warehouseman	50	2,500	—	
Thos. Tringham Smith	Copthall-court	gentleman	25	1,250	—	J. E. Samson.
Henry Cheape	Abchurch-lane	merchant	10	500	—	
William Honeywood	76, Queen-street, Cheapside	gentleman	20	1,000	—	J. S. Yeats.
John Clutton	Hartswood	ditto	50	2,500	—	John Clutton, jun.
Robert Trotter	Borde-hill	esquire	50	2,500	—	
William Polhill Kell	Lewes	gentleman	1	50	—	
John Symington	7, Allsop's-place, Regent's Park.	ditto	10	500	—	Thomas Coates.
Frederick St. John	Chorley	general	100	5,000	—	
Burwood Godlee	Lewes	merchant	20	1,000	—	John Clutton, jun.
J. H. Slater	Newick Park	esquire	100	5,000	—	
J. Villiers Shelley	Maresfield Park	ditto	100	5,000	—	
Robert Wrench	Grove-hill, Camberwell	gentleman	100	5,000	—	
Henry Fletcher	York-terrace, Camberwell	ditto	20	1,000	—	J. S. Yeats.
George Borradaile	Balham	ditto	50	2,500	—	
William Borradaile	ditto	ditto	100	5,000	—	John Clutton, jun.
David Salomans	Tunbridge	ditto	100	5,000	—	J. S. Yeats.
J. Alexander Hankey	7, Mincing-lane	ditto	20	1,000	—	John Clutton, jun.
Thomas George Waller	Cuckfield, Sussex	ditto	60	3,000	—	
James Henry Duffell	Homerton	ditto	50	2,500	—	
William Price	Woodhatch, Reigate	ditto	40	2,000	—	
Richard Price	Withyam, Sussex	ditto	50	2,500	—	J. E. Samson.
John Watson Pringle	17, Panton-square	Captain R. E.	100	5,000	—	
Robert Henry	Pentonville	gentleman	100	5,000	—	
Richard Rushworth Preston.	Temple	ditto	50	2,500	—	

NAME.	ADDRESS.	DESIGNATION.	No of Shares.	Amount.	Seal.	WITNESSES.
				£.		
Henry Surmon - -	Long-lane - - -	veterinary surgeon	50	2,500	(L. S.)	J. E. Samson.
Thomas Borradaile -	Streatham - - -	gentleman - -	100	5,000	—	J. S. Yeats.
Edward Suart - -	Tonbridge Wells - -	esquire - -	100	5,000	—	
Henry Darell Stephens	Temple - - -	- ditto - -	100	5,000	—	Thomas Coates.
George Frazer - -	Argyll-street - - -	gentleman - -	100	5,000	—	W. M. Benett.
Michael Cooper -	48, High-street, Southwark	- ditto - -	35	1,750	—	
Edward Howell -	King-street, Bloomsbury -	- ditto - -	50	2,500	—	Henry P. Marshall.
Edmund F. Moore -	Lincoln's-inn - -	esquire - -	50	2,500	—	
John Young - -	Finsbury-square - -	gentleman - -	100	5,000	—	John Clutton, jun.
John Pullen - -	5, Serjeants'-inn - -	solicitor - -	30	1,500	—	Thomas Coates.
V. Gerald - -	15, Elder-street - -	gentleman - -	10	500	—	Albert T. Creasy.
Thomas Shaw Brandreth	8, Queen-square - -	barrister - -	10	500	—	
Abraham Cohen -	12, Canterbury-pl., Islington	gentleman - -	15	750	—	
Henry Slingsby -	Homerton - - -	- ditto - -	5	250	—	
Lambert Western -	Dover - - - -	- ditto - -	10	500	—	
Thomas Frederick Everingham.	Kensington - - -	- ditto - -	5	250	—	
William Augustus Erck	21, Lombard-street -	- ditto - -	5	250	—	
Alexander Watts Robe	Tower - - - -	Captain R. E. -	15	750	—	
John Clarke - -	Coworth, Sunning-hill -	gentleman - -	25	1,250	—	
Joseph Parkes - -	Great George-street, Westminster.	solicitor - -	50	2,500	—	
Rowland Jones Venables	Parliament-street - -	gentleman - -	25	1,250	—	
James St. George Burke	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	25	1,250	—	
Decimus Burton -	Spring Gardens - -	- ditto - -	30	1,500	—	
John Turner - -	Great Ormond-street -	- ditto - -	25	1,250	—	
Rowland Neate -	3, New-square, Lincoln's-inn.	ditto - -	5	250	—	J. E. Samson.
Peter Erle - -	2, Lincoln's-inn - -	esquire - -	50	2,500	—	
John Edward Armstrong.	3, Stone-buildings - -	- ditto - -	20	1,000	—	
John Rannie.	Legacy Duty Department, Somerset-house.	gentleman - -	10	500	—	
Rowland Hill - -	6, Adelphi-terrace - -	- ditto - -	10	500	—	
John Jones - -	Stock Exchange - -	- ditto -	30	1,500	—	
Walter Alexander Urquhart.	36, Crutched Friars -	merchant - -	22	1,100	—	
Manuel Perez Lozano	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	22	1,100	—	
Guillermo Esteban Balleros.	- ditto - - -	- ditto -	6	300	—	
John Rees - -	Mornington-crescent -	gentleman - -	20	1,000	—	
			£.	607,650		

SEVENTH REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

RAILWAY SUBSCRIPTION LISTS;

TOGETHER WITH THE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

Brighton Railway (Stephenson's Line.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
17 *July* 1837.

Mercurii, 22° die Februarii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the matters of several Petitions, complaining of the Names of certain needy and indigent Persons having been inserted in the Subscription Lists of several Railways, and praying for Inquiry into the Case of the Deptford and Dover Railway Subscription List; and to whom several Petitions containing similar allegations were particularly referred.

Martis, 1° *die Martii,* 1837.

A Committee was nominated of,—

Mr. Warburton.
Mr. Dugdale.
Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Aaron Chapman.
Mr. Charles Lushington.
Sir Eardley Wilmot.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. John Young.
Mr. Daniel Gaskell.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. George Evans.

Ordered, THAT the said Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers and Records.

Ordered, THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Mercurii, 19° *die Aprilis,* 1837.

Order [1st March] that Five be the Quorum of the Committee, read, and discharged.

Ordered, THAT Three be the Quorum of the said Committee.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to report their Opinion, together with the Minutes of the Evidence taken before them, from time to time, to The House.

Veneris, 21° *die Aprilis,* 1837.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Dugdale, Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. John Young and Mr. George Evans be discharged from further attendance; and that Mr. Chalmers be added to the Committee.

THE REPORT - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - p. 1
APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - p. 51

SEVENTH REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE to whom have been referred sundry Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contracts of certain Railway Companies, and, among these, the following Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contract of the Company for forming a Line of Railway from London to Brighton, commonly called Stephenson's Line; viz.

1st. That of James Sebastian Yeats, Secretary of the Provisional Committee of the South-Eastern Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company, objecting to the Subscription Contract of the said Company for forming a Line of Railway, called Stephenson's Line, on grounds therein stated:

2dly. That of certain Members of the Provisional Committee for forming a Line of Railway, called Stephenson's Line, in answer to the Allegations contained in the first above-mentioned Petition:

And who were empowered to report their Observations, together with the MINUTES OF EVIDENCE taken before them, from time to time, to The House;——HAVE taken Evidence on the Matters adverted to in the said Petitions, or having reference thereto, and have heard the observations made on such Evidence by the Counsel for the above petitioning Parties, and, after considering the whole of the Premises, have agreed to the following REPORT:

THE project for the formation of a Company to obtain an Act for making a Line of Railway commonly called Stephenson's Line, to commence upon the Line of the Southampton Railway, and to pass through Shoreham to Brighton, was set on foot at the close of the summer of 1835. According to the first prospectus issued by the promoters of this project, the capital required for the Undertaking was estimated at 1,000,000*l.*, to be raised in 10,000 shares of 100*l.* each, the deposit per share to be 5*l.* The allotment of shares was made by a provisional committee. The allottees were required to pay their deposits to the Company's bankers, and on their producing the bankers' receipt, and signing the Parliamentary Contract and Subscribers' Agreement, certificates were delivered to them. None but allottees were permitted to sign the Deed; where parties proposed to sign by procuration for original allottees, a written authority was required; and for signatures of this kind, by the advice of the solicitor, a separate copy of the Deed was reserved. The subscribers to the Deed, looking to the position of each at the time, are stated to have been, without exception, persons of very high respectability. The number of shares allotted previous to the close of the Session of 1836 is stated to have been 9,000, of which 2,924 were allotted to members of the provisional committee. A new allotment was made of 407 of the reserved shares in November 1836, making the total number of allotted shares 9,407, and the number of reserved shares 593. As to 147 of the

21562. 21867. 21580. 22575. 21590. 21660. 21873. 21876 to 21880. 21693. 21885, 21886. 21619. 21636. 21652. 21667.

the allotted shares, the deposits have been paid, but the Deed has not been
21672. signed. As to 27 of the allotted shares, neither have the deposits been paid nor has the deed been signed; that is to say, the Deed has been signed for 9,233 shares, inclusive of those which have been signed for by procuration, and the deposits have been paid on 9,380 shares. The varied fortunes of the Bill of this Company during the Session of 1836, its success in the Commons' House, and its defeat in the House of Lords, are too generally known to need to be
22506. related. On the Bill passing the House of Commons, the shares rose to 17 or
22516. 18 premium, which was higher than the premium at which the shares of any Company were selling which had not obtained its Act of Parliament. On the
21631. throwing out of the Bill in the House of Lords, the shares fell to 1*l.* discount. The deposit money paid on 9,380 shares would amount to 46,900*l.* The balance remaining in the hands of the Company, after deducting the expenses and
21864. liabilities attendant on the first application to Parliament, is stated to be 9,000*l.*, which would show that the cost attendant on the first application to Parliament was 37,900*l.* With a restrictive clause in their Subscribers' Agreement to the
21747. following effect, that "no further deposit (beyond that of 5*l.* per share already paid) should be called for on account of expenses or otherwise, until the Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the said Undertaking, or some part thereof, should have been obtained," and with an unexpended balance remaining out of that deposit of only 9,000*l.*, the provisional committee had to take their measures for meeting the Session of Parliament of 1837. A general
21708. 21715. meeting was called in August 1836, by a letter addressed to each original sub-
21719. scriber, at which it was stated by the chairman, Mr. Routh, without laying before the persons assembled the accounts of the Company, that the assets would be
21721. sufficient to warrant a second application to Parliament, without making any further call; and instructions were given to the Directors by this meeting to go on with their application in the coming Session. A circular was addressed, on the 14th of November, to the subscribers at large, enclosing a report from the engineer of the Company, Mr. Stephenson, and informing them that certain gentlemen, whose names were given in the circular, had been added to the provisional committee. Among these were certain individuals who did not belong
21576. to the original allottees, but who had acquired an interest in the concerns of the
21801, 21802. 21837. Company by purchasing the shares of allottees. Among these were also the name of an individual, Mr. Sheriff Johnston, who, though an original allottee
21638. 21672. for 25 shares, had neither signed the Deed nor paid his deposit, but is stated to
21853, 21854. have become a holder of other shares by purchase. The plans, which were
21578. deposited in the Private Bill Office on the 30th of November, did not differ in any very essential particulars from those deposited the previous year. The course adopted in respect of the Subscription List was to lodge in the Private Bill Office a copy of the List of Subscribers whose names were attached to the
21704, 21705. Subscription Contract of the former Session, with the addition only of the names of seven persons who had become subscribers and signed the Deed since that Session. The List deposited contains subscriptions, exclusive of those of the parties who signed by procuration, to the amount of 861,400*l.*; the subscriptions
21683. 21696. of the parties who signed by procuration, though not, it should appear, by letter
21876. of attorney, amounted to 66,900*l.* The latter, by some neglect either of the printer or of the clerks of the Private Bill Office, have been omitted from the
22684, *et seq.* Subscription List of this Company, printed by order of The House in the course of the present Session.

The instances in which the Subscription List, of the present Session, of this Company, has been objected to, on grounds similar to those which have been

taken

taken in the cases of the other Subscription Lists which Your Committee has been appointed to examine, such as that the parties are of insufficient pecuniary responsibility and the like, are so few in point of number, and so unimportant in point of amount, that Your Committee does not consider it necessary to notice them. An objection, however, of a general nature has been raised against the Subscription List as a whole, on the ground that it is not a list of new subscriptions, made by parties in support of the Bill of the present Session, but a mere copy of the Subscription List of the last Session; that the subscribers to that former List have already paid their deposit of 5*l.* on their several shares; that by far the greater part of the fund created by those payments has been exhausted in the expenses incurred in the application to Parliament during the last session; that by the restrictive clause contained in the Subscribers' Agreement, and already cited, the provisional committee being prevented, until they obtain an Act of Parliament, from making any further call, the said committee, should they fail in obtaining an Act, would be unprovided with the means of paying the cost of their then renewed application; that a large proportion of the persons whose names appear as subscribers on the List of the last Session, and who, at the commencement of that Session, were as well the holders of the shares set against their names as subscribers for them, have since that period alienated their shares, and did not, in fact, hold any interest in the Undertaking at the time that the List was lodged in the Private Bill Office, at the beginning of the present Session; that many of the members of the provisional committee have been largely concerned in trafficking in shares, and that such traffic is in violation of a clause in the Subscribers' Agreement of the said Company, which expressly declares "that the said provisional committee will not recognise the transfer of any share or shares in the said Undertaking, until an Act or Acts for authorizing or establishing the said Undertaking, or some part thereof, shall have been obtained." It appears to Your Committee, that the course taken by the provisional committee of this Company, in depositing anew a copy of the contract entered into by the subscribers at the commencement of the previous Session, was a course consistent with the provisions of their Parliamentary Contract and Subscribers' Agreement, authorizing them to make application to Parliament, as well in the then ensuing as in any subsequent Session, and was the only course which it was open to the provisional committee to take, consistently with the last cited clause in the Subscribers' Agreement, whereby it is declared that the transfer of shares before the obtaining of an Act of Parliament shall not be recognised. And had it not been for the restriction clause also above cited, prohibiting the said provisional committee, until after obtaining an Act of Parliament, from calling for any new deposit, it appears to Your Committee that the course pursued, in presenting anew the original Subscription List, was far less likely to lead to the abuse of depositing a list of persons of insufficient responsibility; that the course pursued in a similar case by the Directors of Rennie's Line of Railway; that is, of causing a contract to be subscribed jointly by the transferrees of the shares of original subscribers, and such of the original subscribers as had not transferred their shares, and depositing a copy of such contract. The clause, however, in the Subscribers' Agreement in which it is stated that the provisional committee, before the obtaining of an Act of Parliament, will not recognise the transfer of shares, is inconsistent with the form of certificate issued by authority of the provisional committee, on which are printed the following words: "The holder of this certificate will be entitled to shares in the London and Brighton Railway Company, when the Act of Parliament shall have been obtained." That several members of the provisional committee have been trafficking

21747.

21871, 21872.

21742. 21744. 21746.

21871, 21872.

21747.

21751.

largely in the shares of this Company, appears clearly in evidence. The object of the clause in question, declaring that transfers shall not be recognised until an Act of Parliament shall have been obtained, was not, it has been stated by
21966. 21972. officers of the Company, to prevent the sale and transfer of shares, but in all matters concerning the interests of the Company, prior to obtaining the Act of Parliament, to enable the Company to look to the original subscribers only.
21974. Had the transfer prior to obtaining an Act been recognised, that might have been a reason in equity for releasing the original subscriber from his liability.
21953. On the passing of the Act, the Company would advertise for parties to come
21942. in and register their shares; the Directors might then adopt either the original subscriber or, should they think proper, the then holder of the original sub-
21944. 21946. scriber's share. Until the Directors chose to accept the holder of the share, by registering him, the original subscriber for a share was liable for 5*l.* before the passing of the Act, and, after the passing of the Act, for any calls unpaid upon that share, until he should assign the same conformably to the conditions of the
2196. Act. Under the Deed, the original subscriber was the only person liable until the Act was obtained, and the only person who has a claim to be registered. After the Act is obtained, the Act itself provides how assignments shall be made. Should the holder, on the passing of the Act, not be adopted by the Di-
21575. 22426. 22576. rectors, he would have his remedy against the original subscriber. Every share being numbered, there is no difficulty in enabling the holder to trace out the original subscriber as the person he is to look to for making the assignment.
21953. When the holder was registered, the original subscriber would be released from
22273. his liability. It was necessary the original subscriber should be responsible to
22280. 22375. the Company, for neither the Company nor the original subscriber has any means of compelling the person to whom before the passing of the Act of Parliament a share was transferred to come in after the passing of the Act and to register the same.

By the passing of the Bill which consolidates the Subscription Lists of the different Brighton Lines of Railway into one Subscription List, Your Committee feel themselves relieved from the necessity of pronouncing any opinion on the validity of the general grounds of objection raised to this particular List.

To this, their last Report, Your Committee have appended a Table of the different Subscribers, with the sums annexed severally subscribed by them, whom it has appeared proper to Your Committee to omit from the Subscription Contracts which they have examined.

17 *July* 1837.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Lunæ, 10° *die Julii*, 1837.

Present,

MR. WARBURTON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.

Report read, considered and agreed to.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Martis, 6° die Junii, 1837.

Mr. Richard Till - - - - - - - - p. 1
William Vizard, Esq. - - - - - - - - p. 16
Mr. William Routh - - - - - - - - p. 21

Mercurii, 7° die Junii, 1837.

Mr. William Routh - - - - - - - - p. 28
Mr. Isaac Lyon Goldsmid - - - - - - - p. 28
Mr. William Crawshay - - - - - - - p. 34
Mr. Lewis Michael Simon - - - - - - - p. 38
Mr. Richard Lambert Jones - - - - - - p. 42
William Vizard, Esq. - - - - - - - - p. 44
Mr. Leonard Redmayne - - - - - - - p. 45
Thomas Webber - - - - - - - - - p. 47
Mr. James Leman - - - - - - - - p. 48

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Martis, 6° die Junii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

LONDON AND BRIGHTON RAILWAY (STEPHENSON'S LINE).

The Petition of James Sebastian Yeats, Secretary of the Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company, was read.

Mr. *Clarkson* and Mr. *Alexander*, appeared in support of the Petition.

Mr. *Vizard*, on behalf of Stephenson's Line, stated, he did not intend to appear by Counsel.

The Petition of the Provisional Committee of Stephenson's Brighton Railway was read.

Mr. *Richard Till*, was called in; and Examined as follows:

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21550. Mr. *Clarkson.*] YOU are, I believe, the Secretary to a railway from the Southampton to Brighton, on a line laid down by George and Robert Stephenson?—I am.

21551. Called, in ordinary parlance, Stephenson's Line?—Yes.

21552. Were you the secretary for that company during the last session of Parliament?—From September 1835.

21553. Was that the period at which the speculation, or the company, was first formed?—No.

21554. When was the company first formed?—I do not know.

21555. Were you the secretary of the company before the first subscription deed was deposited in the Private Bill Office?—I was.

21556. Who was secretary before you?—I do not know; I do not believe there was any secretary; I really do not know

21557. From whom did you receive the papers deposited with you, as secretary?—From Messrs. Vizard & Leman, and from the committee of management.

21558. The provisional committee?—Yes.

21559. Have you got a prospectus of the company?—I have.

21560. Will you be so good as to allow me to see it; I mean of the company during the last session?—Yes, I have it.

21561. The first prospectus?—Yes. [*The same was handed to Mr. Clarkson.*]

21562. The capital was then 1,000,000 *l.*, in shares of 100 *l.* each, to the amount of 10,000, and the deposit 5 *l.* a share?—Yes, it was.

21563. The provisional committee were, Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, William Hitchens, Richard L. Jones, Thomas R. Kemp, a Member of this Honourable House, Captain John Lawrence, the Honourable Mr. Melville, Robert Murray, Edward Howley Palmer, William Routh and Henry Templer; they were the London provisional committee?—Yes, they were.

21564. Now, the Brighton railway committee consisted of Isaac Newton Wigney, a Member of this House, George Harrington, John Mills, and the high constable of Brighton?—Yes.

21565. Who was the high constable?—John Yeates.

Mr. Richard Till.

6 June 1837.

21566. The bankers in London were, Messrs. Williams, Deacon & Co., and Messrs. Cocks, Biddulph & Co.?—Yes.

21567. And at Brighton, Messrs. Wigney & Co.?—Yes.

21568. Have you before you a list of the present London provisional committee?—Yes, I have.

21569. Be so good as to read of whom they consist?—The Right hon. the Lord Mayor, Edward Blount, William Crawshay, James Forster, Adam Gordon, William Hitchens, Richard Lambert Jones, John Lawrence, the Hon. John Thornton, Leslie Melville, Robert Murray, George Probyn, William Routh, Thomas Allen Shuter, Henry Frederick Stephenson, Henry Templer, William Venables.

21570. Is that the alderman?—Yes.

21571. Have you got the Brighton provisional committee?—No; there is no present Brighton provisional committee.

21572. Can you furnish me with the number of the London Provisional Committee?—Sixteen.

21573. Do you call them directors?—No, they are the provisional committee.

21574. Have you a prospectus also of the speculation for this session?—No, I have not.

21575. Are there any printed?—We did not print one.

21576. Has the provisional committee of which you have given us a list just now, been changed since the second deposit of the copy of the deed in the Private Bill Office, or before?—Before.

21577. Does the provisional committee now remain as it was when the second copy of the subscription deed was deposited in the Private Bill Office?—Yes, it does.

21578. Am I to understand that the scheme, as laid down in the prospectus before us, and which was presented to the Committee in the last session, is in substance the same as at present?—Just the same; when you say in substance, you mean the capital and so forth.

21579. Yes, and the line?—There is a slight difference in the line, which has been explained before the Committee; the terminus differs, but in other respects it is one and the same concern.

21580. Will you be so good as to explain to the Committee the mode in which you proceeded in the last session to allot shares?—I was not secretary when the shares were allotted; when I became secretary, certain rough lists were delivered to me, and from which I made up the allotment-book.

21581. Had the shares been in point of fact allotted before the month of September 1835?—Yes, they had.

21582. Are you able to tell the Committee through whose instrumentality the shares had been originally allotted?—By the gentlemen who acted as the provisional committee before the company was established, with the assistance of Messrs. Vizard and Leman.

21583. Are you able to tell us who the person was that communicated from time to time with the parties applicants for shares, if any did, the portions allotted to them?—No.

21584. Do you not know it from the possession of the papers you now hold?—No.

21585. Have you any reason to believe under what circumstances, and by whom, those shares were represented to have been allotted in the first instance?—I hardly understand the question.

21586. I want to know the gentleman who acted as secretary to communicate to the parties the shares allotted to them?—I believe there was no secretary; but I believe Messrs. Vizard and Leman performed the duty that usually devolves upon the secretary.

21587. Are you able to say that there were parties who communicated to the applicants for shares the portions that the committee chose to allot them?—No, I do not know whether it was communicated by the individual members of the committee, or by Messrs. Vizard and Leman.

21588. But when you came into the office of the secretary the allotments had been, in point of fact, made?—They had.

21589. Had the scrip, or any of it at that time, been exchanged?—Not any of it.

21590. Will you be so good as to explain to the Committee what was the form of exchanging the scrip, and subscribing the deed, after the allotments had been made?—

made?—Each person received a letter, a circular, stating the number of shares that had been allotted.

21591. From whom?—It was signed by Messrs. Vizard and Leman.

21592. That is what we should call a letter of appropriation?—Yes; and they were called upon to pay the deposit of 5 *l.* per share at one of the banker's therein named; and upon production of that receipt to the secretary, and signing the deed, the scrip was delivered to them.

21593. Whose duty was it to deliver the scrip?—Mine.

21594. Have you a sort of talon-book?—Yes, I have.

21595. Do you happen to have with you one of the books used upon the first occasion?—Yes, I have.

[*The Witness produced the same.*]

21596. Where was the deed signed?—The majority of the signatures was taken at the office of the company in Cornhill, and a deed was also sent to Brighton, to be signed by such of the subscribers as lived at Brighton, and some few who happened to be at Brighton at the time.

21597. Will your talon-book enable you to tell the Committee the different periods at which the different applicants, to whom shares were appropriated, actually received them?—Yes.

21598. Allow us to look at it?—[*It was handed to Mr. Clarkson*].

21599. The talon-book is headed with a description of the railway, and contains the number or order in which the shares are delivered, the number of the certificate itself, the number of the shares, to whom shares are delivered, and the date of their delivery?—Yes.

21600. *Chairman.*] Then the date given in the talon-book would inform you of the date of the signing of the deed, would it not?—It would in almost every instance; there may have been one or two exceptions, but I have the date at which period every man's shares were delivered to him in 99 times out of 100; the party came, brought the banker's receipt, signed the deed, and took his certificates.

21601. At the same time?—At the same time.

21602. Mr. *Clarkson.*] We have spoken, among other contents of this book, of the number of the certificate?—Yes.

21603. Am I right in assuming that the number of the certificate continues the same number, where the shares are taken more than five by the same party?—Yes, in this instance I have observed it, but it is not always observed; the number 187 is the banker's number; number 1 to 5 was delivered to Alexander Mill the 15th of October, although the banker's number 187 comprised 10 shares, and consequently the numbers were repeated on the certificate.

21604. And it is the same upon the next number?—Yes, it is.

21605. *Chairman.*] It is not always so?—No, I think not; I may have omitted it when I was hurried.

21606. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Will there be on the certificate in the hands of the holder a corresponding number with the banker's number?—No.

21607. Then is there any number or other writing upon the certificate of the share that will identify it with the talon itself now remaining?—Yes, the number of the certificate; this is the certificate number, from 1 to 5; 187 is the banker's number.

21608. *Chairman.*] Each share is numbered?—They were in five shares; therefore Nos. 1 to 5 contain the certificate of five shares.

21609. There is not only the number given in the certificate, but in the certificate the shares are numbered; for instance, the first talon of a certificate in this book is 187, five shares, 1 to 5; the second talon is the certificate No. 187, five shares, 6 to 10; are the numbers of the shares in those two certificates, 1 to 5 and 6 to 10, expressed upon those two certificates, of which we have here the talons?—They are.

21610. The certificate is not only numbered, but contains the numbers of the shares?—Yes.

21611. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you got a blank certificate?—Yes, I have.

21612. Is the Committee to understand that the banker's number, 187, will appear upon the certificate?—Not upon the face of the certificate; the number that appears upon the face of the certificate is from 1 to 5. As a proper check to myself, I put on the talon the number of the banker's receipt brought to me as

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

an authority to deliver the shares. If a man brought me a receipt for 10 shares, I delivered him two certificates for five each: we had a few certificates in ones.

21613. Is it in this part of the certificate that it will appear; from 5 to 1, or 6 to 10?—Yes.

21614. *Chairman.*] Instead of being the number of the certificate, it is the number of each share comprehended in that certificate?—Yes.

21615. Mr. *Clarkson.*] The shares will show the number granted to the individual and the order in which they are granted; if a man applies the 15th of October, he will have some of the first issued?—Each share is numbered, and it will appear upon the certificate what was the number of the shares.

21616. Then, are the Committee to understand that the share itself will enable you to know at what time it was issued?—Yes, certainly.

21617. And the talon which you keep as a check for yourself will enable you to know to whom it was delivered?—Yes, it will.

21618. Can you tell the Committee what number of shares were originally applied for?—No, I cannot.

21619. Can you tell the Committee what proportion of shares were allotted?—Nine thousand.

21620. Out of 10,000?—Yes, out of 10,000.

21621. Can you tell us the proportion taken by the provisional committee upon the first occasion?—The book is not here. I can tell you presently; it will be here in a minute.

21622. Then let me ask you this question: supposing that a proprietor of shares, either on the provisional committee or not, had in the first instance subscribed the deed for a certain number of shares, the period at which he took those shares being apparent to you from the examination of the talon, in case he should have taken those shares into the market between the time of the first deposit of a copy of the deed and the second deposit of a copy of the deed, would you be enabled to tell us, by seeing those shares, at what time they were taken?—Yes.

21623. For instance, you could tell us whether any certain number of shares produced to-day or to-morrow by any gentleman had been delivered before the deposit of the first copy of the deed or the second?—Yes, unless any circumstance should have happened in the general mode of keeping the book, and I had omitted making such an entry; I ought to be able to tell you, if I have correctly done what I have intended to do.

21624. Do you know at all of your own knowledge, or from any information from any of the provisional committee, whether any of the shares of this railway were in the stock-market between the period of the depositing the first copy of the subscription deed and the second?—No, I cannot answer that; I know from public report that Stephenson's shares were dealt in; I know no more.

21625. Forgive me for asking, have you any shares yourself?—No, I have no shares myself.

21626. Have you had?—Yes, I have had.

21627. When were you first the holder of shares?—When the Bill was thrown out in the House of Lords I bought a few shares, about 15; but I soon sold them again: I thought it was incompatible for me to hold them in my situation.

21628. Did you buy them in the stock-market?—Yes.

21629. Was that after the Bill was stopped in the House of Lords?—Yes, it was; I bought 15.

21630. What was the price paid for them?—I gave 4 for them.

21631. Four premium?—No, one discount; 4*l.* instead of 5*l.*

21632. When did you part with them?—I think I did not hold them a month.

21633. Did they get better?—Yes, they did.

21634. You will not think it curious for me to ask what you got for them?—I made 9*l.* by them, after deducting the 1*l.* for the brokerage.

21635. Can you now tell me how many shares were held by the provisional committee?—Yes, I can; I make 2,854 taken by the provisional committee.

Mr. *Vizard.*] You must be wrong.

21636. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Mr. Goldsmid took 1,390, you know?—It is 2,924.

21637. That makes 292,400*l.*?—Yes.

21638. Now be so good as to give us the names and amounts?—Mr. Goldsmid, 1,300 shares; William Hitchins, 182; Mr. Jones, 172; Captain Lawrence, 132;

Mr.

Mr. Melville, 167; Mr. Murray, 210; Edward Howley Palmer, 82; William Routh, 222; Henry Templer, 242; Edward Blount, 25; Isaac Newton Wigney, 25; George Harrington, 25; John Mills, 25; John Yeats, 25.

21639. Do you happen to have got your original subscription deed here?—Yes, I have.

21640. Will you allow me to look at it for a moment?—[*It was handed to Mr. Clarkson.*]

21641. This is the Parliamentary contract?—Yes.

21642. The subscribers' agreement I wish to see?—[*It was handed to Mr. Clarkson.*]

21643. It is in duplicate; one is sent into the country?—They are two separate agreements.

21644. Not the same thing; one sent into the country?—No; one is full and the other is a continuation of it.

21645. Can you give me the name of the broker of whom you bought, or to whom you sold, your 15 shares?—I think it was Mr. Manning.

21646. Where does he live; did you deal with him on both occasions?—I had only one occasion.

21647. You bought and sold?—Yes.

21648. On both occasions you employed him?—Yes.

21649. Where does Mr. Manning live?—I do not know where he lives; he is on the Stock Exchange.

21650. Is he a member of the house?—Yes, he is.

21650*. *Chairman.*] You mean the Stock Exchange house?—

21651. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Yes, as contradistinguished from the out-door work. Were any shares reserved under the first deed?—There were 1,000 shares not appropriated.

21652. Have they been yet appropriated?—The shares now not appropriated are 593.

21653. I think it was the 15th of October 1835 your deed was deposited, or September 1835?—In November, I think; no, February 1836 it was.

21654. *Chairman.*] Can you give the date of it?—No, I cannot; the Parliamentary agent deposited it.

21655. Mr. *Alexander.*] There is something further than this deed; this is full of signatures; there is another beyond it?—Here is the contract [*handing it to Mr. Alexander*].

21656. *Chairman.*] Four hundred and seven of the reserved shares have been appropriated?—Yes.

21657. Mr. *Clarkson.*] To how many persons have those been appropriated?—I do not think I could tell that.

21658. Have they been recently appropriated?—No, they have not; the last appropriation must have been, I think, in November 1836. It was not material for me to keep an account of the date of the appropriation, so that I am not in a condition to answer it.

21659. *Chairman.*] The talon-book will show?—Yes, when they were delivered; but the date of the appropriation I have not busied myself to find.

21660. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you told us whether the money was paid at the banker's or the office?—Always at the banker's.

21661. Have all the shares for which the original deed was subscribed been taken up?—By "taking up" you mean deposits paid?

21662. No, shares taken up. Have all the certificates been delivered for which the deeds had been subscribed?—No; I have in my possession certificates for which the deed has been signed, and which have not been delivered.

21663. *Chairman.*] And the deposits paid?—Yes.

21664. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Give us the names and number of shares?—T. Allan Shuter, 25 shares; that is all, I think.

21665. Only 25 to Mr. Shuter?—That is all.

21666. Are there any shares or certificates remaining in your hand, or not delivered to the party, where the deed has not been subscribed?—Yes.

21667. *Chairman.*] That is, the deed has not been subscribed, but the deposits have been paid?—Yes, that is the case; the deed has not been subscribed, but the deposits have been paid: John Sanderson, Philpot-lane, 30 shares; Richard L. Jones, 10 shares.

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21668. That is the same Richard L. Jones, one of the provisional committee?—Yes. John Coldbatch, of Brighton, one share; the Honourable Frankland Lewis, five shares; Lewis Levi, 10 shares; William Routh, 90 shares.

21669. That is the same William Routh who is on the provisional committee?—Yes; and Sir David Scott, one share.

21670. Will you be so good as to tell us, if you can, when the deposits were paid upon the shares of those persons you have last enumerated?—The Honourable Frankland Lewis paid his deposit the 3d of October 1835; Mr. Jones paid his deposit May the 4th 1836; Mr. Coldbatch paid his deposit the 2d of November 1835; Mr. Sanderson paid his deposit November 11th 1835; Mr. Lewis Levi paid his deposit the 15th of February 1836; Mr. Routh paid his deposit October 11th 1836; Sir David Scott, November the 10th 1835.

21671. Now are there any shares in your hands, or in the hands of the company, not taken up, where neither the deposits have been paid, or the subscription deed executed, except the reserved shares; you say you reserved 1,000 shares, they were for the land-owners on the line?—Yes.

21672. With the exception of those shares purposely reserved, of the shares appropriated, the 9,000, are there any in the hands of the company for which parties have neither subscribed the deed nor paid the deposit?—Yes, James Chandler, of Epsom, two shares; John Johnson, of Milbank, 25 shares.

21673. *Chairman.*] They were allotted to them, and have not been disposed of to other parties?—No; they have not come to sign the deed, nor have they paid the deposits; they remain under seal in the banker's hands.

21674. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you now enumerated all the shares that remain unappropriated, and not in the hands of the supposed holders?—Yes, I have.

21675. Are there any parties amongst those you have last enumerated, who have subscribed the deed, but not paid the deposit?—No.

21676. Then, if I understand, they consist of persons to whom some shares have been appropriated out of the reserved 1,000; they consist of others where the parties have subscribed the deed, and paid the deposit, but have not taken up the shares, and persons who have paid the deposit, but have not subscribed the deed?—Yes.

21677. But are there any instances of persons who have subscribed the deed, but not paid the deposits?—No, none.

21678. *Chairman.*] The paying the deposit was made a necessary condition of their signing the deed?—Nobody signed the deed unless he produced a receipt, showing he had paid the deposit.

21679. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Then, in point of fact, are there any persons who have signed the deed who have not paid the deposit, to your knowledge?—Certainly I know of none.

21680. Was that invariably the case, that the persons who had signed the deed had previously paid the deposit, or did any of them pay the deposit afterwards?—I know of no instance in which I have a minute of it; I cannot say what took place at Brighton, but I believe none took place there; and I know of no case in which a person was allowed to sign the deed unless he had paid the deposit.

21681. Will you tell us whether any of the 9,000 shares were allotted to persons who did not apply for them?—No, I cannot do that.

21682. Have the persons whose names are not to the subscription deed, and who have paid the deposit, been applied to, to your knowledge, at any time to subscribe the deed?—No, nobody has by me been applied to.

21683. Or by anybody else, to your knowledge?—No; there are so few, I did not pay much attention to them.

21684. Is it true there are 66,400*l.* not subscribed for in the second copy of the subscription deed that was subscribed for in the first?—No.

21685. Are there in amount 66,400*l.* in value of shares subscribed for by persons for others, in the printed copy of the first subscription deed, that do not appear upon the second?—If you have got a correct copy, it is 66,900*l.*; I believe it to be correct.

21686. Now, will you be so good as to tell the Committee when the second subscription deed went into the Private Bill Office?—No, I cannot.

21687. What month was it?—February 1837; I did not deposit it.

21688. *Chairman.*] Who deposited it?—The Parliamentary agent, Mr. Heyward, and Mr. Leman took charge of that part of the business.

21689. Mr.

21689. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you got the deed, a copy of which was deposited in February 1837?—Yes.

21690. I want you to point out to me the names to which I have referred you, amounting to 66,000*l.* and a fraction, that appear upon the first deed?—I have some.

21691. I am asking you whether those persons' names appear upon the deed itself?—Yes, they do upon a deed.

21692. Which deed?—A separate deed; not upon the deed you hold in your hand, but upon a separate deed.

21693. Is it a continuation of the same deed?—No, a separate deed, in consequence of the advice of the solicitors that all persons who signed by procuration or agency should sign a separate deed, which I hold in my hand.

21694. Am I to understand that there is no difference, in fact, between the first and second deed in their contents?—I know of no difference.

21695. *Chairman.*] That deed contains the names of all the parties that signed by procuration?—Yes, it does.

21696. Mr. *Clarkson.*] These being persons signing by procuration to the amount which I have stated, they have signed a distinct deed?—Yes, they do.

21967. No part of the same deed at all?—No, none whatever.

21968. Separate and distinct?—Yes.

21699. And forming no part of the first or second deed?—There are three, I think. Numbers 1, 2 and 3 are duplicates; they are, in short, one deed. They are in three distinct folds of parchment, but purporting to be a continuation of each other; then there is No. 4, which is entirely distinct.

21700. Then do you know when, if ever, the copy of the deed I now hold in my hand, No. 4, found its way to the Private Bill Office?—I do not know, because I did not deposit it; but a copy of that deed was deposited, as I understood, and I assisted in the direction both in the last session of Parliament and in the present session.

21701. Who was the person to deposit it, in fact?—Mr. Leman took charge of it, and deposited the deed with the Parliamentary agent.

21702. You understood the act to be that of Mr. Leman and the Parliamentary agent?—Yes.

21703. Which?—I believe they both went together; I believe so; I do not know the fact, but I believe it to be so.

21704. Then, is the Committee to understand that the manner in which the second application to Parliament was preceded was this, with regard to the Private Bill Office, that another copy of the same 1, 2 and 3 deed, with another copy of a distinct deed, No. 4, was made for the present session, as had been made for the former?—So I understand.

21705. With the addition of the nine persons who have become subscribers since the last session?—No, I do not make nine; I only make seven.

21706. Then, with the addition of the new subscribers since the last session?—Yes, exactly.

21707. Are you able to give us any information of the circumstances under which it happens, that the persons subscribing No. 4 do not appear in the printed list, as any part of that delivered into the Private Bill Office?—I am not able to give you any information.

21708. Will you be so good as to explain shortly to the Committee the mode in which the provisional committee proceeded to take the sense of the proprietors, as to the second application to Parliament this session, after the House of Lords had voted as your petition has described?—A general meeting was called.

21709. Can you tell us when it was?—It was in August, in the year 1836; I thought the date appeared in this circular I hold in my hand.

21710. What is that circular?—It was addressed to the subscribers to the deed in November 1836.

21711. Was it after the general meeting?—Yes.

21712. By what means were the general body assembled in August?—By letter sent to them.

21713. Have you a copy of it?—No.

21714. There will be no difficulty in furnishing it?—No.

21715. Was there any prospectus, or any other document, laid before the general body?—No prospectus was laid before them.

21716. Was there any general statement laid before them?—There was no paper,

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

paper, or anything you can call a statement; the chairman of the committee made his *vivâ voce* statement.

21717. Who was the chairman?—Mr. Routh.

21718. Who was the deputy chairman?—No deputy chairman.

21719. Were the accounts of the company laid before the meeting?—No, they were not.

21720. Were they referred to at all?—Yes, they were slightly referred to.

21721. Was the state of the funds explained?—Only in a general point of view, that the assets would be sufficient to warrant a second application to Parliament without any further call.

21722. Has that turned out to be so, in point of fact?—I am not able to answer that question in that way.

21723. You have said that it was stated, at the general meeting, that the assets would be sufficient to warrant a second application to Parliament in the next session; have they been so?—Do you mean to say, have we money left?

21724. Yes?—Yes, we have.

21725. Have the assets, then, left in your hand been sufficient?—I am sure I cannot tell you.

21726. Who keeps the accounts?—I keep the accounts; but I cannot tell what the expenses will ultimately be.

21727. I want to know whether they have been sufficient?—If the question is, whether we have money left in our hands, I say yes.

21728. After payment of all your obligations?—Yes.

Mr. *Vizard* stated, there was nothing in the petition upon the subject of the accounts.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, in the former case it had been proved that Rennie's company was 8,000*l.* in debt, and therefore he had a right to go into the inquiry.

Mr. *Vizard* stated, that that fact was mentioned in the Petition in that case.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that it was not.

The *Chairman* stated, that it was a matter of not much importance for the Committee to inquire into.

21729. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Can you tell the Committee the state of the accounts at the time of the general meeting?—Yes, I can, generally.

21730. Be so good as to do so?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question, on the ground of its being an examination into the details of the accounts of the company, there being no allegation in the petition upon the subject.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that the constitution of this Committee had arisen from an allegation that a variety of bubbles were in existence, and the general drift of the inquiries had been to ascertain whether there were any funds for carrying the schemes into effect; and as to Rennie's Brighton Line, Mr. Vizard's partner had proved the amount of the debt of the company.

Mr. *Vizard,* in reply, stated, that there was nothing in the petition that had any reference to the present state of the accounts of Stephenson's Company.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that one of the allegations in the petition was, that the conduct of the directors was calculated to encourage gambling.

The *Chairman* stated, that that allegation did not come entirely within the province of the Committee.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that having reminded the Committee of the course taken on a former occasion, he would leave it with the Chairman to decide what course should be pursued; that he was personally very much disinclined to pursue it.

The *Chairman* stated, that in the former case the balance in the hands of the directors was not inquired into.

21731. *Chairman.*] Had you a balance in hand, after paying the expenses of the previous session?—Yes.

21732. And you have not since made any new call?—No.

The *Chairman* stated, that this inquiry was not within the province of the Committee.

21733. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You were telling me that a general meeting was called, at which these circumstances were incidentally mentioned, the result of which was, an instruction to the provisional committee to go on with the application at the next session?—Yes.

21734. You have told me the day of the general meeting?—In August I told you.

21735. You say that Mr. Goldsmid has ceased to be on the provisional committee?—Yes.

21736. Is he the holder of shares, to your knowledge?—I do not know; the holder of certificates, you mean.

21737. Yes. Can you tell us when he resigned the situation of provisional committee-man?—The 21st of November 1836.

21738. You say that the line was altered on the second occasion; is it altered to go through a part of Mr. Goldsmid's own land.

The *Chairman* stated, he did not see that this point was relevant to the inquiry of the Committee.

21739. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Were the shares appropriated to the directors and delivered to them upon signing the deed and producing the banker's receip —Yes.

21740. They have never since been returned to the office at all?—No.

21741. Are you able, or could anybody tell at the time of the subscription, and of the handing in the copy of the subscription deed, in February last, whether the persons who subscribed it in February 1835 were, or any of them, still holders of the certificates of the company?—That is a very comprehensive question. I cannot tell of my own knowledge; but upon seeing the certificates in the possession of the parties, I had reason to believe that they were holders of certificates in the undertaking.

21742. Does the subscription deed itself contain an authority to the provisional committee to go on with the undertaking in any subsequent session of Parliament?—Yes, it does.

Chairman.] Read that clause.

Mr. *Vizard.*] After describing the railway, it says, "that it is to be constructed, established and conducted in such manner as shall be directed by any Act or Acts of Parliament that may be applied for and obtained in the next or any subsequent session or sessions of Parliament, either by the said committee for the time being, or after the first of such Acts, if more than one shall have passed, by the persons thereby authorized to act on behalf of the subscribers." Then there is an authority in the subsequent part of it to add to the numbers of the committee, and to vary the line.

Chairman.] It authorizes them to proceed in that or any subsequent session within certain limits.

Mr. *Vizard.*] There are no limits.

21743. *Chairman.*] Is it under that clause that the provisional committee of Stephenson's Line, in delivering in a copy of the list of subscribers to the Private Bill Office this session, delivered in a list of the names that were attached to the subscribers' agreement of the previous session, making only the additions of those persons who have since that period become new subscribers?—That is the case.

21744. They have done so under the authority of the original subscribers' agreement?—They have.

21745. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Then, in point of fact, there is no new subscription by any of the original subscribers since February 1836?—No, except seven.

21746. And a second copy of the deed of 1835 has been handed in, under the terms that have been read in this deed?—Yes.

21747. Can you turn to any proviso or covenant in the subscription deed I hold in my hand, precluding the provisional committee from making any new call before procuring the Act of Parliament, or in the subscribers' agreement?—Yes, that is the case.

Mr. *Vizard*: "No further deposit or sum shall be called for on account of the expenses, or otherwise, until the Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the same undertaking, or some part thereof, shall have been obtained."

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21748. Until the Act shall have been obtained for carrying into effect the line contemplated, or such parts as the Committee think proper, do you not know that your projected Bill contains a clause recognizing the transfer of shares, and making the holders who register alone liable?—No, I do not.

21749. Do you understand that in your Bill it is intended that, after the procuring of the Act of Parliament, the subscribers to the deed shall still remain liable?—I do not understand anything upon the subject, and therefore I give myself no trouble to think upon it.

21750. I see you are a gentleman of considerable information, and I thought you could give me some light upon the subject?—No, I have not troubled myself upon it.

21751. Have the goodness to read the terms of the rights of the parties in respect of the certificate; who is the person who has any rights or equities?—"The holder of this certificate will be entitled to one share in the London and Brighton Railway Company, when the Act of Parliament shall have been obtained." Signed by the members of the committee.

21752. Then would there be, to your knowledge, any person whatever entitled to anything, benefit or otherwise, arising out of your company's speculation, except the holder for the time being of the certificate?—I really decline to give any opinion upon the subject; it is a matter of law, and a subject that involves liabilities.

21753. Did you not consider, while you were the holder of the 15 shares that you purchased, that you were entitled to all the benefits, and liable to all the engagements?—I do not think I could say that.

21753*. Do you know anything of a company called the Birmingham and Derby Company?—I believe there was such a company as that.

21754. Do you know from Mr. Crawshay that he was a holder of shares in the Birmingham and Derby?—I never had any conversation with him upon that subject.

The *Chairman* stated, that the Committee could not go into an examination as to Mr. Crawshay's solvency.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that the allegation in the petition was, that parties had been gambling in shares.

The *Chairman* stated, that that should be shown with respect to the shares of this company.

21755. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you know whether there are any gentlemen who subscribed the deed in February 1836, who, before February 1837, had become unfortunate in business; do you know that?—No, I do not know one.

21756. I will just show you a name, for I do not like to mention it; this is a sort of proceeding I very much dislike. [*Showing a name to the Witness.*] I have shown you a name in the printed list?—Yes, you have.

21757. Did you know, before February 1837, that that gentleman had been unfortunate in business?—No, I did not; on the contrary, I think it is much later than that.

21758. You think the fact of his misfortune has been later than that?—Yes.

21759. Allow me to show you another?—[*Showing another name to the Witness.*]—Yes, I do recollect, by a public document, that that person was unfortunate before February 1837.

21760. *Chairman.*] The first case was for how many shares?—Mr. *Clarkson.*] 25 shares; and the second is 10 shares.

21761. Here is another?—[*Showing another name to the Witness.*]—Yes.

21762. Twenty-five shares?—That is a very late misfortune.

21763. Is that since February?—Yes, it is.

21764. Since the deposit of the second deed?—Yes, certainly.

21765. Mr. *Vizard.*] That alludes to all, except the 10 shares?—Yes.

21766. Mr. *Clarkson.*] I understand you are misinformed about the first I put to you; are you positive about it?—Yes, I certainly am; it is a thing that can easily be proved; my own opinion is, that it is considerably later than February 1837.

21767. Are you able at all, from the circumstance of the second copy of the subscription deed being a mere copy of the first, to explain to this Committee whether the majority of those gentlemen, whose names were subscribed in February 1836, may or may not be proprietors in this company at all?—If a witness

can

can form an opinion upon such subjects merely from common report, and his own belief of the matter, without any absolute knowledge, I should say they are, generally speaking, shareholders to as large an amount, if not a larger amount, than they were at the time they signed the deed; but I give that answer with all qualification.

21768. Are we to understand that, according to the means you have had of forming a judgment upon a fact, not known to you as a fact, you should consider that the majority of persons, directors and others, whose names are appended to the subscription deed of February 1836, are at present, in fact, *bonâ fide* possessors of shares to the same amount, or nearly so, as they appear for on the deed?—Yes, I do think so.

21769. Do you happen to have got a book in which you can turn to the scrip taken by Isaac Lyon Goldsmid?—I have got a copy of the book.

21770. Will you give us the numbers that appear on the talon, which will correspond with the certificate itself of the shares held by Isaac Lyon Goldsmid?—Mr. Vizard, am I to answer that question?

21771. Mr. *Vizard.*] I have no objection.—The reason why I put that is not out of any disinclination to answer your question; but I thought, giving evidence in this Committee about an individual's private property was objectionable.

Mr. *Clarkson*, till I came here I thought so too.

21772. *Chairman.*] It is the first name in the list of directors; and it seems to me to be a perfectly fair question; he is a subscriber for 120,000 *l.* in the printed list, and the first in the list of the direction?—4,506 to 5,840; 7,501 to 7,505; 8,069 to 8,073; 8,093 and 8,094; 9,906 to 9,935; 9,947 to 9,958; 9,995; that makes 1,390 shares.

21773. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Now will you be so good, by turning to any book that will enable you to do so, to give us the dates of the taking those shares respectively?—The first were taken October the 27th, 1835; the second, November the 27th, in the same year; the third, October the 26th, 1835; February the 13th, 1836, all the rest.

21774. Can you explain to us how it is that they do not run in sequences?—Yes, in delivering shares, in the very hurry of delivering them, it frequently happened I took up a book and took 100 shares out, and 10 were left; the next person that applied for 40, it suited me to take up a fresh book and give him 40; and the next man would take the other 10.

21775. Can you tell me this; I see the last number of shares was 9,995?—Yes.

21776. There were but 10,000 shares altogether, and there are 400 and odd shares at present unappropriated?—I will explain that to you. The greater proportion of the 10,000 shares were printed upon certificates of five; but it was necessary to have some few in ones, and they were numbered off to 9,999. The books so printed just reach that number: that was in fives and ones. When I delivered an odd number, I was obliged to go to the one talon-book to deliver it.

21777. Then I understand the explanation to be, that inasmuch as you had to go from the book containing five shares to the book containing one, there would remain shares in the one book or in the five book that would leave a difference between 9,955, which would appear to be the amount of the allotments and what was actually delivered?—Yes.

21778. They so remain?—Yes.

21779. I wish to know if you can give me the numbers, in order, of the shares taken by the next gentleman to Mr. Goldsmid, Mr. Hitchins; William Hitchins, what were the numbers to him?—266 to 315, 396 to 445, 356 to 375, 386 to 395.

21780. Now give me the dates of those several certificates?—They were all delivered the 15th of October.

21781. Now Richard Lambert Jones?—9,105 to 9,154; that was March 1836 they were delivered.

21782. Is that the whole?—No; 8,690 to 8,709, 9,959 to 9,960, that was delivered January 6th; 4,401 to 4,405, 6,001 to 6,005, 8,600 to 8,689, 6,511 to 6,515, 8,275 to 8,279.

21783. The dates of those?—October the 27th.

21784. All the rest?—Yes.

21785. The earlier numbers would be the earlier month?—Yes.

21786. When was the last month?—March 1836.

21787. Would that be a taking up of shares, after depositing the deed in the Private Bill Office?—Yes, it would.

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21788. Now, if you please, Thomas Reid Kemp?—He does not appear as a holder of shares; he has not any shares; he declined to take any shares.

21789. When did he secede from the committee?—He seceded in the end of the year 1835.

21790. Then take Captain Lawrence?—646 to 745, October 15th, 1835; 3,501, 3,530, and 8,011 and 8,012, October the 22d.

21791. Now we will go to the Honourable John Thomas Leslie Melville?—6,306 to 6,455, November 2d, 1835.

21792. The next, Robert Murray, esq.?—1,106 to 1,315, October the 16th, 1835.

21793. The next is Edward Howley Palmer?—6,491 to 6,505, 6,751 to 6,785, November 6th, 1835.

21794. Now William Routh, esq.?—2,841 to 3,050, October 19th, 1835.

21795. Is that all?—Yes.

21796. Has Mr. Routh no other shares?—Yes, 8,020 to 8,031, October 24th, 1835; 9,185 to 9,254, October 11th, 1836; 9,155 to 9,174, October 18th.

21797. Is that the whole?—Yes.

21798. Were not there some taken by Mr. Routh after the deed was deposited?—Yes, I have named them; October 1836.

21799. After the second deed?—No, none.

21800. Now Captain Templer?—3,136 to 3,345, October the 20th, 1835; 7,201 to 7,230, and 9,945 and 9,946, November the 6th, 1835.

21801. I do not think it will be necessary to trouble you with the Brighton ones; but give me the Right hon. the Lord Mayor, who is one of the provisional committee?—He is not a subscriber.

21802. How came the Lord Mayor to be put upon that paper as a subscriber?—It was known he held shares; that he had purchased shares, and held them.

21803. To whom was that known?—To the committee who put his name upon the provisional committee.

21804. Be so good as to tell us when his name was added to the provisional committee?—It was announced in a letter on the 14th November 1836.

21805. Have you a copy of that letter?—Yes, I have.

21806. Be so good as to let me see it?—[*It was handed to Mr. Clarkson.*]

21807. "Stephenson's Brighton Railway, Cornhill, the 14th November 1836;" this is a general circular, sent to the subscribers?—Yes.

21808. "Sir, I am directed, by the committee, to furnish you with a copy of the report addressed to them by Mr. Stephenson, from which it will be seen, that a careful re-examination of the line, and the most mature consideration of the whole subject, have only served to confirm his preference of the line originally recommended by him. Fortified with this opinion, and satisfied that, although a combination of interests prevailed in delaying the passing of the Bill, the merits of the line, and the benefit to be derived by the public from its early execution, will become too apparent to admit a doubt of its ultimate success, the committee will deposit the requisite plans on the 30th of November, and renew the application to Parliament in the next session. I have the pleasure to inform you, that the following gentlemen, holding a large interest in the company, have joined the committee: The Right hon. the Lord Mayor;" he has no shares at all, you say; "William Crawshay, esq., James Foster, esq., Adam Gordon, esq., Mr. Sheriff Johnson," who never took up his shares; "George Probyn, esq., Thomas Allen Shuter, esq., Henry Frederick Stephenson, esq., Mr. Alderman Venables. I am, Sir, your very obedient servant, *Richard Till*, Secretary." Turn over to the directors of the Brighton Railway Company, gentlemen.

Chairman.] It does not say that they have all newly acquired an interest in the concern.

Mr. *Clarkson.*] "I have the pleasure to inform you, that the following gentlemen, holding a large interest in the company, have joined the committee."

Chairman.] They may have been subscribers before.

21809. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Yes; have you had any communication with the Right hon. the Lord Mayor upon the subject of his interest in the concern?—No.

21810. Of your own knowledge, do you know that he is the holder of a single share?—I was informed he was.

21811. By whom?—By Alderman Venables.

21812. Mr. Sheriff Johnson is amongst this list of persons who held a large interest in the company; how many shares did he originally subscribe for; or did he ever subscribe at all?—He did not subscribe the deed.

21813. He has not taken up his shares?—He has not taken up the shares allotted to him.

21814. Yet you represent him as having a large interest in the concern?—Yes, I did.

21815. Why?—Because the committee understood he had an interest in it.

21816. Which of the committee?—I think it was Richard Lambert Jones.

21817. *Chairman.*] Were the allottees of shares the parties required to sign the subscription deed?—In every instance.

21818. And those only?—Yes, those only.

21819. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Has Mr. Probyn taken up his shares?—Yes; he has signed the deed.

21820. Has he taken up his shares?—Yes, and paid the deposit.

21821. Has he taken up his shares?—I believe they are in my possession; I beg your pardon; I think I have made a mistake; I see 50 certificates were delivered to Mr. Probyn, October the 19th, 1835.

21822. There is a gentleman of the name of Edward Blount added to that provisional committee?—Yes, he is an original member.

21823. I think not; he is not an original member here; now be so good as to tell us the number of his shares?—The numbers of the certificates of his shares are 8,380 to 8,404; and they were delivered to him December 5th, 1835.

21824. Those are the only shares?—Yes.

21825. Now Mr. Crawshay, if you please?—William Crawshay?

21826. Yes; I mean the partner of Mr. Routh?—2,691 to 2,740, October 19th, 1835; 5,916 to 5,965, October 31st, 1835.

21827. Has he taken none since that?—No.

21828. Mr. James Forster?—James Forster, 2,196 to 2,235, October 16th, 1835.

21829. Adam Gordon?—Adam Gordon, 171 to 230, October 15th, 1835.

21830. Is that all?—Yes.

21831. Thomas Allen Shuter?—8,810 to 8,829, February 10th, 1836; 9,280 to 9,284, November 15th, 1836.

21832. I am told I have made a mistake, and that we have not got George Probyn?—Captain George Probyn. I have given those; am I to give them again?

21833. Not if you have given them?—2,771 to 2,821, October 19th, 1835; that is all.

21834. Henry Frederick Stephenson?—9,255 to 9,279, November 14th, 1836.

21835. Alderman Venables?—5,966 to 5,990, October 31st, 1835.

31836. Mr. Sheriff Johnson?—He has not taken up any; they are not taken from me; the deposits are not paid.

21837. Nor the deed subscribed?—No.

21838. Sheriff Johnson's name is appended to this list, in consequence of some representation made by a member of the committee that he was a holder of some shares?—That is not my evidence.

21839. I thought it was?—You say his name was appended to this list in consequence of its being told me that he was a large holder of shares.

21840. Yes?—That was not the reason.

21841. What was it?—That was in the breast of the committee.

21842. Have you any reason to know why his name was appended to it?—Because he was an active intelligent gentleman, and took an interest in the concern.

21843. Do you mean taking an interest in the concern as contra-distinguished from a shareholder?—He took an interest in the welfare of this undertaking.

21844. Were those gentlemen written to before this circular was sent, to know whether they accepted the appointment?—I do not know; I cannot answer that question. They were not written to by me as a matter of form, but the secretary took the orders of the committee.

21845. To your knowledge, strictly speaking, you do not know that any application was made to them at all, unless you made it yourself?—I did not.

21846. Whether the Right honourable the Lord Mayor accepted the appointment as one of the committee, and joined the committee, you do not know?—I only know from the representation of the committee, that it was done.

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21847. Who stated that?—The individual member of the committee who recommended him to be added.

21848. Who was it?—The individual gentleman do you mean?

21849. Yes?—I think it was Mr. Jones that communicated with the Lord Mayor.

21850. And that the Lord Mayor accepted the office of committee-man?—Yes.

21851. Who applied to Mr. Sheriff Johnson, do you know?—No, I do not.

21852. Then are we to understand that it was the intention of the company, through you, their secretary, to represent when you say, "I have the pleasure to inform you that the following gentlemen, holding a large interest in the company, have joined the committee," that they were holders of shares, or that they wished well to the company?—I should say that it was intended to convey by that that they were holders of shares.

21853. With respect to Mr. Johnson the fact was otherwise?—No, I believe not; I believe he was a holder of shares.

21854. That he had obtained them by purchase?—Yes.

21855. From whose information do you obtain that?—From general conversation in the committee-room; I do not know that I can say who.

21856. Those circulars were sent without any assurance to you that those gentlemen had accepted the office, or were proprietors of shares?—Not by the individuals themselves.

21857. Their names were appended to this letter in consequence of the representations made to you by members of the committee from time to time, that those several gentlemen were holders of shares, though not subscribers to the deed, and as such had an interest in the concern, and had joined the committee?—Yes.

21858. Was that letter sent after the general meeting?—Yes.

21859. Has there been any circular sent to the subscribers since that period?—No.

21860. The provisional committee now stands much in the same situation as they did then?—Yes.

21861. Can you tell the Committee, in a table, as you say you can distinguish the dates at which the several shares of the subscribers were taken up; can you be so good as to point out to the Committee such shares as were taken in the month of February 1836?—It would be a work of time; I must look through 200 or 300 names.

21862. It can be done between this and to-morrow?—Yes. Do you wish it to be done now?

21863. No.

The *Chairman* stated, that upon further consideration it appeared to him desirable that the Committee should be put in possession of some information with respect to the balance remaining in the hands of the provisional committee at the termination of the proceedings in Parliament in the last session.

Mr. *Vizard* was heard to observe upon the suggestion thrown out by the Chairman.

Mr. *Clarkson* was heard in answer to the observations of Mr. Vizard.

The Committee-room was cleared.

After some time the counsel and parties were again called in, and informed by the Chairman that the opinion of the Committee was, that the question should be put, what was the remaining balance after the expenses of the preceding session had been paid.

21864. Mr. *Clarkson*, to Mr. *Till.*] Be so good as tell the Committee what was the balance remaining in the hands of the company, after the expenses and liabilities of the first application to Parliament?—It was about 9,000 *l.*

21865. Will you be so good as to turn to your book, and tell me the shares allotted to Mr. Vizard?—No. 7,271 to 7,345, delivered November 20th, 1835.

21866. Was that all?—Yes, that comprises 75 shares, which is all that Mr. Vizard took, 75 shares.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

21867. What was the amount of the estimate?—The amount of the estimate was 1,000,000 *l.*, and the amount for which the deeds are signed, Nos. 1, 2 and 3, is 861,400 *l.*

21868. *Chairman.*]

21868. *Chairman.*] That is excluding those signed by procuration?—Yes.

21869. Mr. *Vizard.*] When you say a million, have you taken it from the prospectus, or is that the estimate according to the engineer's evidence?—It is something less upon the engineer's evidence.

21870. Do you know whether any shares were issued and a premium received on them, and brought to the credit of the company?—Certainly not; no premium beyond the deposit.

21871. Does the subscriber's contract provide that the provisional committee and directors will not recognize any transfer of shares before the Act of Parliament is obtained?—Yes, it does.

21872. I will thank you to read that clause?—"That the said provisional committee will not recognize the transfer of any share or shares in the said undertaking until the Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the said undertaking, or some part thereof, shall have been obtained."

21873. Were you instructed by the solicitor that no party was to be allowed to sign the Parliamentary contract, except he came in person, or produced a letter of attorney?—That was my instructions; and no person was allowed to sign the Parliamentary contract unless he came personally, as the owner.

21874. Or produced a regular letter of attorney?—Yes.

21875. *Chairman.*] You say the owner; you mean the allottee, the person to whom the shares had been allotted by the provisional committee?—Yes, that is what I mean.

21876. Mr. *Vizard.*] To provide for persons who had shares allotted to them, and, living at a distance, could not attend to sign the deed, was a separate deed prepared to meet that case?—There was.

21877. Was that to avoid the expense of sending the other deed round the country, or the expense that parties would have been put to if they had procured letters of attorney?—That was the reason given.

21878. Were you always given to understand that the signatures to that deed were never to be calculated upon as coming within the subscribers under the Standing Orders of the House of Commons?—It was so understood.

21879. Is the amount subscribed to the deeds, independent of that deed, sufficient to meet the Standing Orders?—Yes, it is.

21880. Even with reference to that deed, in all cases, were written authorities produced by the parties who signed it?—In every instance.

21881. Do you know whether any attempts were made to induce people to become subscribers?—Certainly not.

21882. If it is stated in a petition to the House of Commons, or in any other way, that shares were issued at a premium, is it true or false?—It is false; the premium must mean more than the deposit; that is false.

21883. Do you know whether that deed contains the usual provision to add to the number of the committee, and to vary the line?—Yes, it does.

21884. You say there are a certain number of persons who paid their deposits, and have not signed the deed, and you have quoted the names of Jones and Routh, two of the members of the committee; they have signed for a considerable number, notwithstanding?—Yes, they have.

21885. Can you speak, generally, to the character of the parties who have signed the original subscription deed?—From what information I have been able to obtain, from many years' knowledge of the city of London, I should say it is a very highly respectable deed; and I have been confirmed in that by other and better judges than I am.

21886. Upon looking through the list, is there any one you should reject, if he was to tender himself to sign now?—No, not taking his position at that time, there is no gentleman I should have objected to.

[Re-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*]

21887. You read to us just now a clause in the subscribers' deed that "they would not recognise the transfer of any shares until the passing of the Act;" was that the subject matter of discussion by the provisional committee?—Not in my presence.

21888. Was that subject ever discussed by the committee themselves, and the propriety of it?—I do not recollect that it was.

21889. That was in the deed of 1835?—Yes.

21890. You were the purchaser of some shares that had been transferred after the

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

the deed had been executed?—I purchased some certificates of shares that had not been recognized by the company,

21891. You became a purchaser, and transferred shares after the execution of the deed, and the company would not recognise the transfer?—Yes, I became a purchaser of certificates.

21892. They would not be shares till the Act passed?—No.

21893. Therefore the deed referred to certificates, and not shares?—Yes.

21894. Do you know from Mr. Vizard who prepared that deed?—It was prepared in his office.

21895. Do you not know from Mr. Vizard, after he prepared that deed with this clause he transferred his own shares?—I have only just heard it admitted by Mr. Vizard in this room; I did not know it before.

21896. Do you know it from any member of the committee that they have done the same?—I do not.

21897. You have told Mr. Vizard that no attempts were made to induce persons to become subscribers; you limit it to that and not to members of the committee?—The answer was as to subscribers.

[The Witness withdrew.

William Vizard, Esq., was called in; and Examined, as follows:

W. Vizard, Esq.

21898. Mr. *Clarkson.*] YOU are the solicitor of this company?—I am joint-solicitor with my partner, Mr. Leman.

21899. Were you so from the year 1835, when it was originally contemplated?—I was so for two or three years before that, while Sir John Rennie's line was under the consideration of the present committee, and I have continued so to the present time.

21900. Did you subscribe the deed of 1835 for 75 shares?—I believe I did; I have no doubt I did.

21901. How long did you keep them after you subscribed the deed?—Some of them I kept a very few days, I think.

21902. How many of them did you part with in a very few days?—I do not recollect exactly. I took 75 shares, intending some of them for two brothers of mine. I signed for the whole number, the directors knowing nothing of the use I was to make of them, and I allowed some of them to go to two brothers, they paying me the amount of the deposit I paid.

21903. You subscribed for how many out of the 75 for your brothers?—Fifteen.

21904. For each?—No, between them.

21905. Do you mean that you parted only in a few days with those 15?—Yes; I do not mean to say I did not part with others afterwards.

21906. Do you recollect the quotation of them in the market at that time?—At what time?

21907. At the time you subscribed the deed?—I believe there was no quotation in the market. I do not believe they were at a premium when I signed the deed.

21908. After the first few days, when did you part with any of the remainder?—I do not recollect, but many months afterwards.

21909. How many?—Late in the spring or the summer of 1836.

21910. Did you do it by means of a broker?—Yes.

21911. Who was that?—I believe it was Mr. Shewell, one of your directors.

21912. That was in the spring or summer of 1836?—Yes.

21913. How many did you dispose of then?—I do not recollect.

21914. About how many?—I will tell you how many I have now, I have 30.

21915. Are they a part of your original 75?—I cannot tell.

21916. Have you speculated in them?—I have bought some, and sold some since.

21917. I want to know what have been your transactions in the shares of the company from the original signature of the deed?—I subscribed for 75 shares; I allowed my brothers to take a certain number of them, I think 15, I was solicitor to the Northern and Eastern Railway at the same time; and one of the directors having suggested to me to buy some of those shares, then at a premium, I agreed with him so to do; and, according to my recollection, his broker was Mr.

Mr. Shewell, and I employed Mr. Shewell in that capacity as my confidential agent to sell some Brighton shares, and buy some Northern and Eastern.

21918. Who was the director of the North Eastern?—Am I bound to tell that?

21919. Yes?—Mr. Goring Thomas, then a partner in Esdaile's house. I recollect that transaction passed; and I think that Mr. Shewell was the broker employed, through Mr. Goring Thomas, to sell the one and buy the other.

21920. That, you think, was in the spring or summer of the last year?—I think it was; I do not recollect exactly.

21921. What quantity of the Brighton did you sell?—That I cannot recollect.

21922. What quantity of the North Eastern did you purchase?—I do not recollect that either.

21923. What was the state of the market?—They were both at a premium; the Brighton at a considerably higher premium than the North Eastern, which was partly the inducement for me to make the exchange.

91924. Cannot you tell me the number of shares?—No.

21925. After that transaction, when was the next transaction of either sale or purchase?—I think in the course of a week or two I bought some more Brighton.

21926. Through whose agency?—I am not sure whether at that time Mr. Shewell was employed, or whether I employed my own broker.

21927. Who is your broker?—Mr. Easthope.

21928. If it was not Mr. Shewell, it was Mr. Easthope?—Yes, or it might be my bankers.

21929. I must ask you their names?—Messrs. Coutts & Co. I am inclined to think it was not Messrs. Coutts; I know Mr. Easthope bought or sold some for me.

21930. Can you tell me what number of shares that transaction consisted of?—No, only the result; I began with 75, and I now have 30.

21931. You have the best means of telling us whether the 30 are any part of the 75, because you have heard the secretary say he can identify them?—I have no doubt, by means of the secretary, it might be traced whether the shares I hold now are the same or not. If you ask me, I should say my belief is that they are; but as I both bought and sold, the shares got mixed up together in the bundle in my box, and I took no care whether they were the one or the other.

21932. Perhaps you will take the trouble of looking at them between this and to-morrow?—I shall have no difficulty in producing the receipts.

21933. You cannot tell the Committee the extent of your dealings in sales or purchases?—I know they are very trifling.

21934. Can you give us an idea?—I can answer it thus, that I never became possessed of 75 shares again.

21935. You might deal in them very extensively without that?—I think I had two transactions; my first was that with reference to the North Eastern; I subsequently bought some more, and subsequently sold some.

21936. Was there any time you had none?—No.

21937. Was there any time you had less than 30?—No.

21938. Are you able to be positive upon that?—I have not the smallest doubt of it.

21939. If I was to ask you whether you could be certain you had not dealt in these shares to the extent of many hundreds, you could answer me?—Certainly I have not.

21940. I merely ask you for my own information, because you cannot fix upon any one number?—

Mr. *Leman* suggested whether this inquiry did not come within the rule pointed out by the Committee this morning as not having any relation to the subscription list; that he merely threw it out for the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that the inquiry had relation to the allegation in the petition that shares had been trafficked in, in the face of one of the clauses in their own deed, that no shares should be trafficked in.

The *Chairman* recommended Mr. Clarkson to limit his examination to the establishing of facts.

21941. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Were you aware of the existence of that clause in the deed prepared in your own office, in which the provisional committee declared that they would not recognise the transfer of any scrip or certificates till after the passing of the Act?—Perfectly.

W. Vizard, Esq.

6 June 1837.

21942. How do you reconcile your transactions in the market with that provision in the deed?—At the time I signed the original subscription deed I knew I had made myself liable, at all times, and under all circumstances, to the full extent to which I had subscribed the deed; and I knew also, that no act of mine could relieve me from that liability, and that I transferred those shares by handing over the certificates, as has been constantly done by all holders and proprietors, in this and every other railway company, perfectly aware that this clause in this deed was in all other deeds, and that they took it with the equitable interest that it gave them; that the directors had a right, after the Act was obtained, to adopt the assignee of the person the then holder of the shares, or the original subscribers; and if the then holder of the shares should be rejected by the company, he would have a claim upon me for reimbursement of the money.

21943. Is that the whole of the answer you have to give to that question?—Yes.

21944. Then do you, as a lawyer, consider that the subscription of that deed which made you liable to a call only to the amount of 5*l.* and no more, until the Act was obtained, did in point of fact make you liable for more, unless it was obtained?—I never had the smallest doubt that the deed made me liable to pay the whole of the 100*l.*, but limited that sum to 5*l.* till the Act was obtained; but after the Act was obtained I should have to pay 95*l.*

21945. Suppose the Act was not obtained?—Then my liability was limited to 5*l.*

21946. And then did you consider, if the Act had been obtained, that your liability would co-exist with any liability on the part of the holder of the shares?—Until the directors, acting under the Act, had registered that assignment of my shares, I had no doubt they might look to me, and I was liable to the full extent; and not only do I say that, but acting under the advice of counsel, I have given that opinion to my own clients in another railway.

21947. Do you not know that your own Bill contemplated a clause making liable the holders of the scrip?—I do not know that there is any such thing; I should say personally I have not read the Bill.

21948. How could you tell what your liabilities were when the Act passed, if you had not read it?—I am speaking of the deed.

21949. You are speaking of the liabilities after the Act passed?—I have not read this Bill; I do not know that there is anything peculiar in it, but I have no doubt that it is like the former Bill, which I have read.

21950. What does it say, as to the certificates of registered holders?—I do not know.

21951. Having read that Act, you do not know whether it contains a clause making the registered holders of certificates or scrip the persons liable for the undertaking?—Yes, I am aware of that; I remember the clause.

21952. Have the goodness to read that clause?—" And be it further enacted, that the said company shall, and they are hereby required, at their first or some subsequent general meeting, and afterwards from time to time, to cause the names of the several corporations, and the names and additions of the several persons who shall then be, or shall from time to time thereafter become entitled to shares in the said undertaking, with the number of shares which they are respectively entitled to, and the amount of the subscriptions paid thereon, and also the proper number by which every share shall be distinguished, to be fairly and distinctly entered in a book to be kept by the said company; and after such entry made, to cause their common seal to be affixed thereto; and the said company shall, from time to time, cause a certificate or ticket, with the common seal of the said company affixed thereto, to be delivered to every such proprietor on demand, specifying the share or shares to which he is entitled in the said undertaking, such proprietor paying to the said company the sum of 2*s.* 6*d.*, and no more, for every such certificate or ticket; and such certificate or ticket shall be admitted in all courts whatsoever, as *primâ facie* evidence of the title of such respective proprietors, their successors, executors, administrators or assigns, to the share or shares therein specified; but the want of such certificate or ticket shall not hinder or prevent the proprietor of any of the said shares from selling or disposing thereof; and such certificate or ticket may be in the words or to the effect following; (that is to say), ' London and Brighton Railway Company, No . These are to certify, that *A. B.*, of , is the proprietor of the share (or shares), No. ,

of

of the London and Brighton Railway Company, subject to the rules, regulations and orders of the said company.'"

21953. How do you apprehend that the company would ascertain who were the proprietors of scrip?—I apprehend the course to be pursued, under that clause, would be, that there would be an advertisement for shareholders to come in and have their shares registered; and if persons presenting the certificates came, and claimed to be shareholders, and the company adopted them, they would be registered, and, when registered, that would relieve the original subscribers; if the company chose to register the original subscribers only, they would be entitled only to put those on the register.

21954. Do you conceive, as a lawyer, that the company have the power of determining which they will adopt?—Yes, I have no doubt of it, under that clause of the Act; then comes the clause of the Act which prescribes what shall be done to entitle him to be an assignee; the Act prescribes the form in which the assignment shall be made, and provides that no person shall be admitted until the previous calls have been paid.

21955. There have been no calls?—There may be a call the day after the Act has passed.

21956. Or long after?—Yes.

21957. I wish you to tell the Committee whether you mean to say, as a lawyer, that, under the clause you have taken the trouble to read, you believe the directors had the power of rejecting any *bonâ fide* holder of their certificates?—Yes.

21958. Look at that certificate [*handing a Certificate to the Witness*] and read it?—"The holder of this certificate will be entitled to one share in the London and Brighton Railway Company, when the Act shall have been obtained."

21959. Do you mean to tell the Committee, as a lawyer, you have no doubt that the committee of directors would be entitled, under that clause, to reject the claim of any *bonâ fide* holder of those certificates?—Yes, I think so.

21960. *Chairman.*] Is that the construction of the words in the certificate, or the words of the proposed Act you refer to?—

Mr. *Clarkson.*] I put them both together.

Witness.] I have no doubt, under the deed, the original subscriber is the only person liable till the Act is obtained, and the only person having any claim; but when the Act is obtained, the Act provides how assignments shall be made, and no assignee can claim, except by an assignment made under the form and subject to the conditions prescribed by the Act.

21961. We are quite agreed upon the subject of the liability of the subscribers to the deed till the Act passes; there is no doubt of a man who subscribes the deed making himself liable till the Act passes, and if any call shall be made beyond that first call, he shall be liable up to that time. But let me read to you these preceding clauses: "And be it further enacted, that all the shares and proportions of and in the said undertaking, or the joint stock or fund of the said company, shall, to all intents and purposes, be deemed personal estate, and be transmissible as such, and shall not be deemed to be of the nature of real property." And then this clause: "And be it further enacted, that the said company shall, and they are hereby required, at their first or some subsequent general meeting, and afterwards from time to time, to cause the names of the several corporations, and the names and additions of the several persons who shall then be or who shall from time to time thereafter become entitled to shares in the said undertaking——

21962. *Chairman.*] It does not say holders?—According to the provisions of the Act, I think I understand the thing perfectly now.

21963. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you mean to say that you should not consider, under this clause of the Act, that the person who had become entitled to shares in that undertaking would be the real *bonâ fide* holder of the scrip?—I do not think he would.

21964. *Chairman.*] It does not define what is the title?—The Act does, in another part; it prescribes the form of assignment, and therefore the assignee can only claim under that assignment. It is restrained till the Act passes, by the restriction in the deed; and when the Act passes, he is restrained by the regulations in the Act.

21965. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you consider that the clause in the deed in which the provisional committee refuse to recognise any transfer of shares until the passing of the Act, was introduced for the purpose of preventing the transfer of shares

W. Vizard, Esq.

6 June 1837.

or encouraging it?—I do not know how the clause was put in, whether by my counsel or whether the deed was copied from another deed: if you ask me my opinion, I say it is in every deed.

21966. I ask you the object of it; not whether it is in every deed?—The object was, to enable the company to look to their original subscribers.

21967. Do you not believe that the object was to prevent the proprietors transferring their shares?—It was not intended to restrain the proprietors doing what they liked with their shares; but the object was to prevent the members of the provisional committee looking to any one but the parties whose liability they had originally taken.

21968. You do not think it was intended to prevent the proprietors dealing in the shares?—No; so far as they could accomplish it, the object was that the provisional committee should not be bound to look beyond them.

21969. You say it was to prevent them being bound to look beyond the original proprietors; do you believe that was the whole intention?—I believe it was.

21970. You do not believe it was intended to check the transfer of shares?—I do know whether it operated ——

21971. That is not the question. I want to know whether it was not so intended?—I cannot tell what passed through the minds of other parties; in my own view it was to save the committee the trouble of looking anywhere beyond the original subscribers.

21972. Was it with a view of keeping the shares in the hands of those whose respectability was a guarantee to the company?—They knew they would be compelled to meet the liabilities whether they liked it or not; but the object was that the committee might know who the parties were they were to send their notices to.

21973. Am I to understand that the object of that clause was not to prevent the proprietors transferring their shares?—I do not believe it was.

21974. But you believe that the only object of it was to save the directors from the trouble of looking elsewhere than to those who originally signed the deed?—And that those parties acknowledging should not be made use of as a reason why the original subscribers should be relieved from their liability; if the directors had acquiesced in the transfer, that would have been a reason in equity why they might be relieved.

21975. And you consider that to be the only object of those words?—Yes, I dare say it operated in the other sense also.

21976. It did not operate with you in that sense?—Not to the full extent; I knew what I was about.

21977. And you have so advised; and as a lawyer you consider when this Act passed, the fact of a man being *bonâ fide* holder of scrip purchased in the market, would not necessarily and as such entitle him to require the directors to register him as the holder?—No, not until he had done what the Act requires.

21978. Done what?—Taken an assignment in the form required by the Act.

21979. Taken an assignment?—Yes.

21980. From whom?—From the original holder.

21981. You are of opinion that the holder of shares sold in the market in the ordinary way, as you sold them in the market, which is not always attended with the circumstance of knowing of whom you buy or sell, would not entitle the party to be registered as owner?—That is my opinion.

21982. And so you have advised this provisional committee?—I do not know that the question has been put to me; but I should advise them that they were not bound to put any man upon the register who did not come in with an assignment in the form given,

21983. Is not that an assignment after the passing of the Act?—I believe not.

21984. Turn to the clause?—I know that the Act applies to an assignee after the passing of the Act, but I have no doubt, under the prohibitory clause we have so often adverted to, the directors are not bound to recognize any man who takes under an assignment before the passing of the Act.

21985. Do you mean to convey to the Committee that the directors under the Act would not be bound to register a *bonâ fide* holder of shares or scrip ostensibly purchased in the market before the Act was passed?—I believe they are not.

21986. Not unless they were the original subscribers to the deed?—Yes, they are bound to register the original subscribers, but not bound to register any person how

W. Vizard, Esq.

6 June 1837.

who takes an assignment before the passing of the Act; and when the Act comes into operation, there is a provision in the Act to regulate the assignment.

21987. Do you think that a party purchasing in the market scrip *bonâ fide*, might be by the directors under this Act driven to his action against the person of whom he purchased, to recover his money?—I should say I have no doubt of it.

21988. Then you, knowing or believing as a lawyer, that the person who purchased scrip in the market before the Act passed would be driven to his action against the party selling it, you yourself sold some shares in the market?—I sold some and bought some.

21989. Do you know who you sold to?—No.

21990. Or who you bought of?—I have no doubt I could trace both the one and the other.

21991. You can trace it by an action?—I do not know how to trace out a defendant by an action; I never heard of that before.

21992. You were fully of that opinion when you went into the market?—I do not know that I thought much about it: I have no doubt of it now, and if I had taken the same pains you have compelled me to do since I have been in this room, I should have arrived at the same conclusion I have now.

21993. That would not prevent you going into the market?—No.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Routh*, was called in; and Examined as follows:

Mr. *W. Routh.*

21994. Mr. *Clarkson.*] ARE you one of the provisional committee of this company?—Yes.

21995. Are you the holder of any shares now?—Yes.

21996. How many?—Is that a question which I ought to answer?

21997. *Chairman.*] As a member of the provisional committee, you must answer it.—Eighty shares.

21998. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you any other shares elsewhere you are not the holder of at present?—No.

21999. Are you in possession of all the shares you subscribed the deed for?—No.

22000. Why not?—Because I sold some of them.

22001. With the exception of those you sold, are you in possession of all the shares for which you subscribed the deed?—Yes.

22002. What proportion of the shares for which you subscribed the deed, have you sold?—I subscribed the deed for 222 shares.

22003. £.21,000?—£. 22,200.

22004. How soon after that did you sell any portion of them?—I sold 50 shares in about six weeks afterwards.

22005. In the market?—No.

22006. Where?—To my partner, Mr. Crawshay.

22007. About how soon after did you part with any more?—Not for a long time afterwards. I am not aware exactly. I was not aware you were going to ask these questions, and I am not prepared with the dates.

22008. Did you sell any in the market?—What do you mean by "in the market."

22009. Through a broker?—Yes.

22010. What was the name of the broker?—Some through Mr. Lawrence and some through Mr. Simone.

22011. Is Mr. Lawrence a broker?—Yes.

22012. Any relation to the director?—A brother.

22013. What portion of them did you sell through Mr. Lawrence?—I do not recollect.

22014. About?—I am not able to state; I really do not recollect.

22015. Could you find it out for us by to-morrow?—If he is in town, I can learn it through him.

22016. Did you sell them at a premium?—Yes.

22017. What premium?—Those through Mr. Lawrence at 12 premium.

22018. Did you sell those you sold through Mr. Lawrence before or after those you sold through Mr. Simone?—I do not recollect.

22019. Did you sell those you sold through Mr. Simone at a premium?—Yes.

22020. Can you tell us the amount of those?—No, I cannot.

Mr. *W. Routh.*

6 June 1937.

22021. Or the period?—No, I cannot.

22022. Have you purchased as well as sold?—I purchased one.

22023. Only one?—That is all until after the Bill was lost.

22024. *Chairman.*] Do you mean you made one purchase, or bought one share?—I bought one share before the Bill was lost; the governess of my children had very foolishly purchased a share at 15 premium, and I took it off her hands.

22025. What was the state of the market at that time?—I believe that was about its value; but I did not think she ought to hold it, and I took it off her hands.

22026. Did that leave you in the possession of 80 shares at that time?—I cannot recollect.

22027. Surely you can tell; it is rather an interesting subject; how many shares have you been in possession of at any one time?—222, the number I subscribed for.

22028. Never more?—Never.

22029. Were you ever in possession of less than 80?—No, I think not.

22030. You do not know it accurately?—I think I can state that positively.

22031. Have you bought or sold shares in the undertaking after the Bill was lost?—After the Bill was lost in the House of Lords, I bought several shares; I believe 50 or 60.

22032. Through whom?—I do not recollect; I think through Mr. Simone.

22033. What were they at then?—At one discount.

22034. Did you buy any others but those 50 or 60 through Mr. Simone?—No, I think not.

22035. Did you buy none through Mr. Lawrence after that?—I believe not.

22036. Is that all the transactions you have had in these shares?—Yes.

22037. Then I understand you have sold through Mr. Simone and through Mr. Lawrence, and purchased one in the manner you have described very kindly, and you have also purchased, you think, through Mr. Simone, some 50 or 60 since the Bill was lost in the Lords?—Yes.

22038. And that was all?—No, I purchased some lately.

22039. How lately?—A month ago.

22040. How many?—I believe 16; I am not sure.

22041. Through whom?—I do not know.

22042. Through a broker?—No, I believe not.

22043. Who did you purchase them of?—Mr. Crawshay told me there were 50 shares to be sold, and he asked me if I would take a third of them, and I did; but I cannot tell you the price of them.

22044. Was there any time when you had so few as 20 shares?—No.

22045. You are quite sure of that?—Yes.

22046. Are there any shares to which your name is appended, which you have not taken up?—How appended?

22047. Appended to the subscription deed?—No; what do you mean by appended?

22048. To the deed?—Certainly not.

22049. Have you paid upon any shares you have not taken up?—No.

22050. Have you paid deposits upon any shares you have not taken up?—No, certainly not.

22051. If it shall have been said you have subscribed the deed, aye and very lately too, for a certain amount of shares, I think 90, upon which you have paid deposits, but which shares you have not taken up, is that a mistake?—Yes, decidedly.

22052. Are you then the holder of shares upon which deposits have been paid, for which you have not subscribed the deed?—Yes.

22053. How long has that been the case?—I do not know; it was during the time the Bill was before Parliament last session.

22054. How comes it you have not subscribed the deed for those shares?—I did not subscribe the deed, because there were some shares of my own that I disposed of, and with the consent of my brother directors I directed Mr. Till to give me other shares to replace them, upon which I paid my deposit.

22055. I do not quite understand that; there were some shares of which you were the proprietor, and which you have sold?—Which I have disposed of.

22056. That means sold?—If you please.

22057. Sold in the market?—Yes.

22058. What

22058. What shares had you of your own at the time that arrangement was made?—I do not recollect.

22059. Had you as many as 20?—Yes, decidedly.

22060. What time of the year was it?—In April or May.

22061. Will it appear upon the Minutes as a matter directed by the provisional committee?—I am not sure of it.

22062. Were you present at the time it was discussed?—I am not sure about that.

22063. What was the amount of the shares that were discussed?—Seventy shares and 20 shares.

22064. What was the necessary amount of shares to qualify a director?—I do not know what was filled into the Bill; I think it was contemplated to fill in 10.

22065. What was the agreement about it in the deed?—I am not aware.

22066. Was there any number of shares?—I do not know indeed.

22067. Can you tell the Committee how many shares you actually held at the time you represented to your brother directors you had parted with some, and requested Mr. Till to give you others?—No.

22068. Can you give any notion?—No.

22069. How can you tell it was more than 20?—I am sure of it.

22070. It was in May last year you sold those, for which you requested a substitute?—Yes.

22071. Through whom were they sold?—Seventy were sold through Mr. Lawrence.

22072. Any through anybody else?—No.

22073. What was the state of the market in April last year?—Those shares were sold at 12 premium.

22074. In April in last year?—Yes.

22075. Did you take the shares from Mr. Till by the permission of the directors?—Yes.

22076. Ninety in number?—Seventy.

22077. And the other 20?—Afterwards.

22078. Did you pay any premium upon them?—No.

22079. You had sold the 70 shares through Mr. Lawrence at 12 premium, and upon an application to the directors, obtained permission from them to receive 70 shares, and 30 at par?—Yes.

22080. Were they not at 17¾ premium at that time?—Certainly not.

22081. I find them so quoted?—That may be.

22082. Did you explain to your brother directors you had made a profit of 12 premium?—I made no profit.

22083. They were at 12 premium?—Yes.

22084. Did you explain that to them?—I told them what they had been sold at, but they were sold through Mr. Lawrence.

22085. How many transactions in Stephenson's Brighton shares have you had through Mr. Lawrence?—I do not recollect any but that; I recollect no others; I may be wrong.

22086. You can give the Committee no notion of your general transactions in those shares?—I do not know that I can; I did not keep them in any books; I could by applying to Mr. Simone and Mr. Lawrence.

22087. Forgive my asking whether it has been profitable or otherwise?—Profitable.

22088. Have you any objection to state the amount?—I do not know.

22089. Everybody knows that Mr. Routh is a man of the world and a gentleman?—I cannot state the amount.

22090. Has it been very profitable?—No, certainly not.

22091. You have dealt in some hundreds?—No.

22092. You had but 80 left out of 222?—I understood by your term dealing, at any one time.

22093. You have dealt in hundreds altogether?—Perhaps.

22094. You say you cannot give us an idea of the extent of your transactions; about how many may you have had in buying and selling in the market of Stephenson's Brighton shares while you have been a director?—Perhaps six or seven.

22095. Not more than that?—I think not more than that.

22096. Have

Mr. *W. Routh.*

6 June 1837.

22096. Have all your transactions, except with Mr. Crawshay, been through Mr. Simone or through Mr. Lawrence?—I think so.

22097. Were you aware that one of the provisions in the deed of the subscribers, of which you were one, was, that the directors would not recognise the transfer of any shares until the passing of the Act of Parliament?—I dare say I did read the deed at the time, but I have no recollection of any such clause in it, though there may be.

22098. If there had been such a clause, should you have considered yourself at liberty to transfer your shares to parties in the market, pending the application to Parliament?—I can see no impropriety in it.

22099. Why not, if there was a clause in it to prevent it?—I should have felt myself bound in honour to ratify it.

22100. Should you not think you were acting in the teeth of the deed, by which you had declared you would not recognise any such transfer?—Not if I meant to ratify it afterwards.

22101. What interpretation should you put upon the clause, declaring that the subscribers would not recognise the transfer of any shares until the Act passed?—I never understood that clause in any other way than that the original subscribers to the deed remained liable.

22102. The original liability and the continuance of the liability of the original subscribers would not be of any material assistance to the unhappy assignee?—But it would to the concern.

22103. How should you have proposed to remedy the inconvenience, supposing it to have followed, of the directors refusing to have recognised your transfer of your shares to another, in the event of their refusing to do so?—I should have considered, upon such an event happening, I was liable to stand in the same shoes I originally did.

22104. You would have considered yourself bound to put the party in the same situation?—Yes, if the directors refused.

22105. How would you have done it, if you did not know who it was?—He would know.

22106. You do not know who you bought of, how could you set him right?—That is a question more proper for a lawyer than for me.

22107. Forgive me for asking, were you a subscriber to the Birmingham and Derby?—Yes.

22108. For 10,000*l.*?—Yes.

22109. And the North Midland, 5,000*l.*?—Yes.

22110. The York and North Midland, 7,500*l.*?—Yes.

22111. And the London and Cambridge, 20,000*l.*?—Yes.

22112. Another subscription to the London and Cambridge for 20,000*l.* more, making 40,000*l.* in the whole?—No, 10,000*l.*

22113. £. 10,000, you say?—Yes.

22114. That made 30,000*l.*?—Yes.

22115. And the Brighton, 22,000*l.*?—Yes.

22116. Making, in the whole, 84,700*l.*?—Yes.

22117. Be so good as to allow me to ask you, whether you were a director, or a provisional committee gentleman, upon any one of these railways?—No, none, except the Brighton.

22118. What proportion of the shares of these several companies do you now hold with reference to the amount you took?—I hold 50 shares in the York and North Midland.

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question.

22119. Mr. *Clarkson.*] How many of those several companies have obtained Acts, if any?—I believe, all you have mentioned.

22120. Now I propose to ask you how many of those several companies, that have obtained their Acts, have you registered shares in?—In all.

22121. To what extent?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question, as not coming within the scope of the inquiry as to the subscription deed.

Mr. *Clarkson* was heard in support of the question.

The *Committee* decided that Mr. Clarkson might ask whether the Witness had refused to register his shares.

22122. Mr.

22122. Mr. *Clarkson.*] For how many shares did you subscribe in the Birmingham and Derby?—One hundred shares.

22123. How many of those have you registered for?—Fifty.

22124. The North Midland?—Fifty.

22125. How many have you registered?—Fifty.

22126. You think the whole?—Yes.

22127. The York and North Midland?—One hundred.

22128. How many registered?—Thirty.

22129. The London and Cambridge, how many did you subscribe for?—Three hundred.

22130. And registered?—Twenty.

22131. Then it was 100 in each of the others?—Yes.

22132. And 300 in the London and Cambridge?—Yes.

The *Chairman* suggested, that the Witness should be asked whether he had been applied to, and refused to register.

22133. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Were the remaining shares you have not registered, shares you have sold in the market?—No.

22134. What has become of them?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question, of what Mr. Routh had done with his shares in other companies.

The *Chairman* stated, that if similar inquiries were made of the proceedings of other persons, not so respectable as Mr. Routh, the Committee could not draw a distinction; that if the inquiry was made in the one case, it ought to be in the other.

22135. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you been applied to at all to register the remaining shares in these companies?—No, I have not.

22136. I dare say they would be glad to have you, but you have not the shares, nevertheless?—Yes, I have some of them.

22137. You have the shares, but have not registered them?—Yes.

22138. How many more have you in the Birmingham and Derby?—None.

22139. The North Midland, how many have you?—None.

22140. The York and North Midland?—None.

22141. The London and Cambridge?—I have 50 in that.

22142. Have you dealt with any of the shares of these companies in the market?—No.

22143. Or by means of a broker?—Yes.

22144. That is what I mean, through your market-gardener; you have dealt with all of them in that way?—Yes, I think so.

22145. You could not tell me the state of the account in the Brighton?—No.

22146. What is the state of the account in the others; it rather looks up?—No, I think not.

22147. You have sold at a premium?—Yes, I have sold at a premium.

22148. And purchased at a discount?—No.

22149. None?—No.

22150. A smaller premium?—I believe not.

22151. In those that have been the subject matter of speculation in the market, you have made profit upon them?—Yes, some.

22152. Generally speaking?—Yes.

22153. Why did you sell those shares; were they sold for the purpose of making a profit in the then state of the market?—In some cases, from a doubt as to obtaining the bills.

22154. And in others, because the market was looking pleasant for a sale?—I chose to sell them.

22155. I do not mean any disrespect to you, but it was profitable?—Yes, sometimes.

22156. That was the inducement?—There might have been other inducements, and there frequently were.

22157. That formed a part?—Yes.

 22158. *Chairman.*]

Mr. *W. Routh.*

6 June 1837.

22158. *Chairman.*] In the London and Cambridge, in which you have sold none, you were a subscriber for 300, and have sold none?—No.

22159. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You have registered 20 and hold 50?—Yes.

22160. In all these companies where you hold less than you originally subscribed for, is it in consequence of having sold your interest in them?—In some cases.

22161. Why have you not registered the other 50 in the London and Cambridge?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question.

Witness.] I wish to answer it.

22161*. *Chairman.*] You originally subscribed for 300; you registered 20, and you believe you have 50 more?—Yes.

22162. Are those part of the original 300?—Yes, and the question is, why I did not register them ——

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question.

Mr. *Clarkson* waived the question.

22163. Have you been applied to by the company to register?—No.

22164. Have you paid all the deposits upon them?—No, only upon 100.

22165. Mr. *Clarkson.*] In the London and Cambridge?—Yes.

22166. Have you paid all the deposits upon the other three sets?—Yes.

22167. *Chairman.*] Have you paid the subsequent calls upon all the shares, including the 50 that you hold?—Yes.

22168. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have the kindness to tell us whether the two fifties and the 30 you speak of as having registered in the Birmingham and North Midland, and the York and North Midland, are the fifties and 30 of the original shares purchased?—The original shares.

22169. You have not bought and sold in those companies?—No.

22170. Be so good as to tell us whether, in the sales in the London and Cambridge, do you mean 50 besides the 20?—Yes.

22171. Can you tell us the amount you sold?—I only sold 30.

22172. What became of the 200?—I never took them.

22173. You subscribed the deed for them?—Yes.

22174. Paid the deposit for them?—No.

22175. And never took the shares?—No.

22176. You did not like the look of the thing. Did you subscribe the deed for the whole amount of the other three?—Yes.

22177. And took them all?—Yes.

22178. Have you sold others?—Yes.

22179–80. With reference to the periods at which the Act was obtained by the Birmingham and Derby, when was it you sold the 50 shares in the Birmingham and Derby; how soon after the Act passed?—

The *Chairman* stated, that Mr. Clarkson could not go into all the transactions in detail with respect to each of these companies.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, he wanted to learn how soon after or before the Acts were obtained it was the witness had parted with a portion of the shares for which he had subscribed.

Witness.] To the best of my recollection, the 50 Birmingham and Derby shares I parted with, I let my partner, Mr. Crawshay, have, without any premium at all.

22181. At what time?—Within a day or two after signing the deed.

22182. Before the Act passed?—Yes.

22183. Perhaps you signed the deed for him?—No.

22184. Do you know what shares Mr. Crawshay had of his own at that time?—He had none at that time.

22185. The Birmingham and Derby?—None.

22186. Mr. Crawshay seems to have subscribed it?—That is William Crawshay; I am speaking of George Crawshay.

22187. In

22187. In the north of England, were they sold in the market or to Mr. Crawshay?—They were sold in the market.

22188. Can you tell us how near to the period of the passing of the Act?—No.

22189. You sold them at a premium?—Yes.

22190. And also the York and North Midland?—The York and North Midland I allowed a friend of mine, Mr. Murray, to have.

22191. Not at any premium?—Yes, I think it was at a small premium.

22192. *Chairman.*] Was there any previous understanding in the case of the Cambridge, that you should not take up all the shares?—There was an understanding that the explanation that Mr. Vizard gave me should be satisfactory.

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the answer, as being irrelevant to this inquiry, and he also objected to the transactions of another company being gone into.

The *Chairman* stated, it was in justification of the witness's conduct that he put the question.

Mr. *Clarkson* requested that Mr. Routh should furnish the Committee with the dates of the various sales and purchases of shares in which he had been engaged.

The *Chairman* stated, that the fact had been already established.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22193. There are a certain number of shares which you hold for which you have not signed the deed; has the deed been brought to you for signature?—No.

22194. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Was it with the consent of the directors you did not sign the deed at the time you had these 90 shares?—I do not recollect that.

22195. Was not it a part of the stipulation, that you should have the shares without signing the deed, or of course you would have signed it as part of your duty?—I do not recollect that.

22196. Was not it with their perfect knowledge you had not signed it?—I do not know that.

22197. Was not it with the perfect knowledge of Mr. Till you had not signed it?—Yes, no doubt of it.

22198. Was the deed in the habit of being on the table when the directors met?—No.

22199. Or being called for?—No.

22200. Mr. *Vizard.*] Is not the deed kept locked up in the strong box at the banker's?—I have not seen it since I signed it, 12 months ago.

22201. Is there not a direction that the deed shall be kept locked up in the strong box at the banker's?—I should think that very proper.

22202. Has the secretary ever applied to you to sign the deed?—No.

22203. Has it been by any direction of your own he has not applied to you?—Certainly not.

22204. May I ask you whether you do not consider yourself fully competent for all the shares you have subscribed, whether in this company or any other?—Perfectly so.

22205. Can the sales of shares be traced in the broker's book?—I do not know

22206. *Chairman.*] You are an iron-master?—Yes.

22207. Which connects you very much in interest with the progress of railways?—Very much.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mercurii, 7° die Junii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. Thornely.
Mr. D. Gaskell.	Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *William Routh,* was called in; and further Examined as follows:

Mr. *W. Routh.*

7 June 1837.

22208. Mr. *Clarkson.*] HAVE you been able to procure for us the dates of the transactions to which your evidence referred yesterday, and the several amounts of them?—No, I am not able to do it.

22209. You have examined your papers for that purpose, and you do not find that they afford you the means of doing it?—I have looked at some papers, and I do not find that they do.

22210. Give me leave to ask you: I enumerated a certain number of adventures in the shape of railroads, to which I called your attention yesterday; was there any other to which you were a subscriber?—Yes, I subscribed to the Blackwall, which you did not mention.

22211. Mr. *Thornely.*] In the case of wealthy and respectable gentlemen becoming subscribers to those railways, are you aware of any custom by which they shall not, or is there any understanding by which they shall not take up the shares after the passing of the Act?—No, I am not aware of any such custom.

22212. Of course, you consider they are liable to do so if called upon by the company?—Yes.

22213. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Wherever it turns out that an individual of the character the honourable Member represents declines to register, or has not in fact registered all the shares for which he has originally subscribed, it is the act of his individual discretion, and not in consequence of any arrangement with the company?—Yes, so I understand.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid,* was called in; and Examined as follows:

Mr. *I. L. Goldsmid.*

22214. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Were you one of the original promoters of a scheme for a railway to Brighton called Stephenson's Line?—I cannot say I was one of the original promoters, because I did not begin quite so early as some others, but very early.

22215. When did you become connected with the company first?—I think in 1827 or 1828; my attention was called to it I know in 1829, in consequence of my having property at Brighton.

22216. Did you subscribe the deed of that company in the year 1835 or 1836?—Yes, in the year 1835, I think it was; I think it was in September 1835; I think it was about the 26th of September 1835; I took down the date.

22217. For what number of shares, in the first instance, did you subscribe?—I was going out of town, and I took for myself and friends 2,000 shares. I beg leave, in the first instance, to state, I have no concern, directly or indirectly, in any other company whatever, either as a director or shareholder in any railway company whatever. It may save you some trouble in telling you, that I took originally 2,000 shares; I submitted a list of the names of persons to the extent of 610 shares out of the 2,000 shares, so that the directors should adopt those names in lieu of mine.

22218. Was that before the deed was subscribed?—Yes, before I signed the deed.

22219. You

22219. You yourself signed the deed originally for 2,000 shares?—No; I applied in the first instance for 1,600 shares, I then applied for 400 more, making altogether 2,000 shares; out of the 2,000 shares I submitted names, to the persons who had the distribution of those shares, for 610, so that that reduced my number to 1,390.

22220. Then you did not subscribe the deed yourself for more than 1,390?—I subscribed the deed to that extent, because among the 1,390 there were some persons' names I did not consider sufficiently responsible to stand between the company and myself, and therefore I gave my name to protect the company to the extent of 1,390, and those names were included in the 1,390.

22221. Were the company aware, before you subscribed the deed, that 610 of the shares, for which you were applicant, were for other persons, and that of the 1,390 constituting the remainder you were subscribing for, some were for persons who were to be the holders of those shares whom you did not consider as good security as yourself?—Those I subscribed the deed for were persons of a perfectly responsible condition, quite as much as myself; and for the 1,390 I considered I was responsible, and I consider I am responsible up to this hour, and till the Act passes; till I am relieved according to the original engagement I entered into; and to that extent am I now bound. And whatever I may have done with these shares, and I shall be quite at your service to tell you what I have done with them, I consider I am responsible; for the 1,390 shares; you understand me, I hope?

22222. Quite. Now, be so good as to tell me what proportion of that 1,390 shares you subscribed for the reason last given?—To the extent,—I do not know that I am bound to answer it,—but I should say to the extent of 200 or 300 shares, having 1,200 shares belonging to myself; I have answered you what I think is a little inquisitorial mode of proceeding, to endeavour to ascertain that I hold myself out to the public as a subscriber for what I have put my name to; what I have disposed of internally is a little inquisitorial to inquire into.

22223. I prosecute the inquiry with that feeling; I do not want to know the names of the gentlemen who formed the subject of your last consideration, but as to the 1,200 shares, will you be so good as to inform us how long you held those 1,200?—I cannot tell you exactly how long I held 549, because I sold them in small portions during the early part of the year 1836.

22224. Do you mean to the extent of 549?—Yes.

22225. Then, 549 of those shares were disposed of in small portions in the early part of 1836?—No, not in the early part of the year; I should say the latter part of the year 1836; it may have been from July to December.

22226. Was it after the resolution of the House of Lords not to proceed further with the Bill in that session?—I should think I sold some before, but some afterwards.

22227. Have you any means of acquiring a knowledge of the dates of those transactions?—I dare say I have; but perhaps you will allow me to finish the whole disposition: then, I perceive, on the 28th of April 1837, which was the day Mr. Stephenson's Bill was thrown out in the Committee of the House of Commons, I had 651 shares, never having parted with them prior to that period. I was the proprietor of 651 of Stephenson's shares at the 28th of April of this year.

22228. The others were 590?—No, 549. Except those 651, I cannot be very accurate to a share or two, more or less; the 651 I had as late as the morning the Committee came to the decision of giving a preference to Rennie's Line; they had never been out of my possession.

22229. Of how many shares are you now the proprietor in this company?—On that very day I sold 380 at two discount, at least my broker sold them for me.

22230. How soon after the resolution of the House of Commons?—The same day.

22231. How soon after in point of time; within an hour?—I do not know; I gave an order to the broker to sell them; I did not go out of my office.

22232. Might it have been within an hour?—I should rather think it was; but I will not be very accurate upon that point; I have a responsible broker and I desired him to sell them; and in two or three hours afterwards he sent me a broker's note for them.

22233. Have you got that with you?—No.

Mr. *I. L. Goldsmid.*

7 June 1837.

22234. What was the name of that broker?—I have no objection to tell, if you have any curiosity, but still I do not think I have any right to answer it; I have two brokers: I hardly know whether I am right in answering the question.

22235. We will not trouble you, though we are quite entitled to it according to the practice of the Committee?—Are you? Mr. Vigne sold for me 300.

22236. At what time in the course of the day did you receive the broker's note of the sale?—I cannot tell you that.

22237. Was it in the forenoon?—Yes; I left the city at four o'clock.

22238. Were you in attendance upon the Committee in the House of Commons on that day?—Not the slightest; I preserved a perfect neutrality, and kept away.

22239. Can you tell us how soon, in the course of the day, you received information that the Committee had voted that Stephenson's Line was not further to be considered?—I mean to say distinctly, I had not received any information whatever.

22240. You sold the 300 and odd shares without any knowledge at the time of the decision of the Committee?—Yes, from my own impression that Stephenson's Line would on that very day be thrown out; that the Committee would decide against it, from the different views the Committee took of the question: I had no information at all.

22241. You sold the 300 and odd shares from no knowledge of the fact that the Committee had come to that resolution, but from your own judgment, formed from what you had observed, that Stephenson's Line would be thrown out?—Yes; I cannot say what led me to that decision; it was the workings of my own mind; what I tell you is the fact; I had no information upon the subject.

22242. I asked you how many shares you were the proprietor of at present?—Two hundred and seventy-one shares; I have never bought a single share, and therefore they are all original shares.

22243. Now as to the shares you disposed of in the latter part of 1836, from July to December, are you able to tell us in what proportions they were sold?—Not at all.

22244. Or what the state of the market was?—No, they were sold at various prices.

22245. You probably recollect the state of the market from July to December 1836; were they, upon the whole, sold at a profit?—Decidedly.

22246. Can you give us any notion of the gross profit?—As an average, perhaps at 7*l.* or 8*l.* a share; no, I should think about 6*l* a share; I will not be very accurate, but somewhere thereabout.

22247. Mr. *Vizard.*] Would that be the average?—I should think it was 6*l.* or 7*l.* a share.

22248. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You never parted with any of those remaining 271?—No, I never parted with any of the 651 before that day.

22249. Did the shares become worse in the market after the House of Commons had come to that resolution?—I sold them at two discount, they may have come down to three discount.

22250. My question was, whether the market had not become worse?—I believe they have been down to 3 or 4, and there is only 5*l.* paid; they could not have been much lower.

22251. They have been as bad as they could be?—The instalment was 5*l.*, and they have been as low as 1*l.*, at a discount of 4*l*; I sold them at 2*l.* discount; I believe I sold 80 of them at one and three quarters, and the others I sold at two discount.

22252. Have you any knowledge to whom those shares were sold?—Since I have been in the room, Mr. Crawshay told me he bought 200 of them; I have heard that in the room.

22253. But in the ordinary transactions of sales by a broker in the market, has the vendor any necessary knowledge of the party to whom the thing is sold?—He has a necessary knowledge to whom they are sold, but they are frequently sold to another broker.

22254. And that broker purchases for a principal?—Yes; and it was not till I came into the room, that Mr. Crawshay told me he bought 200; he said I might mention it, or I should not have taken the liberty.

22255. My

22255. My question was, whether the effect of a sale and purchase through a broker in the market does not leave the seller in ignorance for whom his shares are bought through the instrumentality of the other?—Yes.

22256. So that, when the director of a company, or other person interested in its concerns, sells a parcel of shares in the public market through a broker, whether they shall get into the hands of a responsible or irresponsible person the seller neither knows or inquires?—Always keep this in mind: although I parted with those pieces of paper, I am responsible for 1,390 shares.

22257. That is a question of law?—I do not know the question of law, but I have put my name to the deed, by which I am bound till the directors allow me to retire; and though I may regret the difficulty of settling the differences between us, be the consequences what they may, I am bound by it.

22258. Have the goodness to tell the Committee how you contemplate that a party purchasing in the market is to be protected, in the event of the directors refusing to register the shares of which the party shall be the holder, when you, for instance, who are the person that sells, actually do not know who that party is; as between you and the company I quite understand, if your law is correct, that the company are no losers; I quite understand your feeling of honour, and no doubt your conviction of your liability as co-existing with that deed, until, in point of fact, your name is removed from that deed by the directors?—Yes, according to the Act, if it shall pass.

22259. But, as you do not know the person to whom the shares are distributed, and as that person the directors may refuse for some reason to register, how do you propose to indemnify that person?—I suppose the Act will provide that they should transfer the shares according to the law laid down by the Act; I shall send in my name.

22260. This is a transaction before the passing of the Act?—Up to the passing of the Act I am responsible.

22261. As between you and the company; but how is the person who has purchased the shares to be indemnified; suppose the company refuse to register him?—He takes that piece of paper as a security for the money he has paid.

22262. Do you consider that the holder of the scrip you have sold is entitled to be registered?—I think he is, provided it is consistent with the Act after it has passed.

22263. Either the party who holds the shares is, in point of fact, entitled to register them when the Act has passed, or the directors have the power of refusing if they think fit?—I cannot conceive what they would do; I only know what is binding on me.

22264. How do you contemplate protection to any party to whom you may have transferred shares before the Act passing, in the event of the directors refusing to register him?—My law is very limited, and it will not enable me to answer your question.

22265. Have you read the subscribers' deed?—No.

22266. Nor the Parliamentary contract?—No; I have signed my name to it.

22267. You are tolerably conversant with the conditions of deeds of this kind?—Yes; and I will tell you what the clause is, that no person is allowed to transfer his shares before he has paid up all the calls previously made.

22268. That is your understanding of the conditions of these deeds?—Yes, that is the general understanding in the city of London.

22269. But, in the instance of the present company, there being but one call, and there being a provision in the deed that there shall be no other call till the Act has passed, as soon as that call is paid, you have a right to transfer the shares?—Yes, I conceive I have, and that I have a right to send in the names to have the shares transferred.

22270. My question is, applying itself to your proceedings before the Act, you are the holder of 100 shares; the Act has not passed; you are desirous of disposing of them; you have paid a call of 5 *l.* a share, which you are alone liable to do; you then hold yourself entitled before the Act passes to transfer those shares?—Certainly not; decidedly not.

22271. Then why did you transfer the shares in 1836 before the Act passed?—I do not know; I sold those vouchers to the parties who purchased them through my broker.

22272. You make a distinction between the vouchers and the shares?—Yes, my

Mr. *I. L. Goldsmid.*

7 June 1837.

my distinction is this: I have got a piece of paper, representing I hold so many shares; I put them in the hands of my broker; he finds A., B. or C., who takes them from me, he knowing at that time I am responsible for the amount. Supposing the directors have the power of calling for a further sum of money, they would only look to me, and his loss would be confined to the sum he paid me.

22273. If you consider that any proprietor or subscriber has a right to transfer his shares, between the period of subscribing the deed and obtaining the Act, do you consider he is entitled to transfer the scrip?—Yes, because it does not create in the person purchasing a greater responsibility than the amount of the money paid; he may take these pieces of paper and throw them into the fire, and I stand in the gap before him; I am responsible; A., B. or C. gets hold of them; nobody can find out who he is; I am the person putting my name to the deed, and I am bound.

22274. Suppose, instead of throwing them behind the fire, he keeps them, and then goes to the directors after the Act is passed, and with the scrip in his hand claims to be registered, is he not entitled to be registered?—Yes, if the conditions of the Act allow it.

22275. Did you contemplate registering for 1,390 shares?—There you ask the workings of my mind; according to my present impression, I did not.

22276. Did you contemplate registering for anything like that large proportion?—Certainly, I have taken a large interest; the differences that exist between me and the directors induced me to part with a great many of them.

22277. The fact of your parting with them, was influenced by your differences with the directors?—Yes; but you will allow that 650 shares is not a contemptible interest in any concern.

22278. I cannot conceive anything contemptible that belongs to you?—You are pleased to be complimentary.

22279. But there is a very material difference between that amount and the number you took originally; do you mean to say that it is the understanding in the city that the party to whom the scrip is transferred is not entitled to become a shareholder for the amount of the scrip?—I mean to say this, that they cannot bind him to pay up a larger sum of money than he has advanced.

22280. If he refuses to register, they cannot make him?—No.

22281. I want to know whether your notion of the subject in the city is this: that a man being a *bonâ fide* holder, and desirous to register, the company, of which he is a proprietor, have a right to refuse him?—No; I do not think, according to my view of the Acts passed upon these subjects, that the Act would give authority to the directors to refuse; but you must know better than me whether the Act gives the company the power to refuse him.

22282. Then upon that supposition, in your mind entirely *bonâ fide* no doubt, that the purchaser of scrip in the market would, when the Act passed, if he continued to be the holder, be entitled to be registered as such, was it that you sold such of the shares as you did sell?—When I sold the shares, I conceived they had a justifiable claim to be registered.

22283. I want to know the notion upon which you proceeded?—I think, suppose you had purchased those shares of my broker, and you held them, and went to the directors, and presented yourself to ask for a transfer of those shares in your name, I should think, according to the usual mode, you would be entitled to call upon the directors to transfer the shares; but bear this in mind, I should conceive the moment the Act passed, the directors had a right immediately to have made a call for the purposes of the company, and insisting upon it.

22284. Then is it your opinion, however it may serve you or the company, to have the honour of your name attached to them, do you consider, in the event of a call upon shares, some of which have not been registered, if you had been a subscriber for those shares that did not happen to have been registered, you would have been responsible to the extent of the calls?—That depends upon whether there was a clause in the Act to that effect; I should not conceive I was.

Mr. *Vizard* submitted that these were questions of law upon the construction of the deed.

The *Chairman* stated that the questions now put were similar to those that had been put yesterday; but perhaps the learned counsel would not press the inquiry any further.

Mr. *Clarkson* was heard in support of his examination, and stated he

was

was not asking the witness his opinion upon points of law, except so far as it was supported by the practice in the city, and in connexion with the steps the witness had taken.

Witness.] It is the usual clause where there is no Act, that whenever a call is made, no person shall transfer his shares till he has paid the call made; what would be the law if the Act passed I do not know, and therefore I cannot say that.

22285. But you know very well under what impression it was you parted with those shares you parted with in the market?—I conceive that the person who held them would be entitled to call upon the directors to transfer the shares, but that the directors would have had no claim upon him; they would have looked to me, till the Act passed, for all the consequences.

22286. I have understood from you that the transferee of any shares of yours would not be compellable by means of that transfer to register for those shares?—No, but he would be entitled to do so.

22287. Was it with that impression you sold those shares?—Yes, I meant all after the Act passed.

22288. But if you admit the person to whom the shares are sold must be unknown to the seller, how are the public to be protected against these shares getting into improper hands?—The Act will take care to do justice between the public and the shareholders.

22289. That is the only explanation you can give me?—Yes.

22290. Supposing that those shares which you sell in the market, are the subject of resale and retransfer over and over again, until at length they get into the hands of an insolvent party, do you consider that the directors would be liable to register the owners of those shares, insolvent or otherwise?—If A. applies to have his shares registered, and the directors tell him at the time, "You are to pay 5 *l.* a share," I ask you, can you answer that question?

22291. Suppose they do not tell him so?—It is in the power of the directors to do so.

22292. Many a man can pay 5 *l.* a share, who cannot pay the remainder?—Very true.

22293. I want to know from you how the directors are in any respect protected against those shares getting into such hands as have been the subject matter of observation and remonstrance in this Committee from time to time, between the time of subscribing the deed and the passing of the Act of Parliament?—Till Parliament steps in and determines what proportion of responsibility shall rest upon the subscriber, or upon the person who bought the shares, I am responsible.

22294. To the company; but how is the public to be protected?—Parliament will protect the public; I bind myself, till there is a Legislative decision, to the parties who go before Parliament.

22295. Let us put this proposition: suppose the Act of Parliament for Stephenson's Line should be passed to-morrow, for how many shares do you hold yourself responsible, there being no call till they are registered?—1,390.

22296. Suppose the Act was passed to-morrow, and the whole of your 1,390 were registered, for how many shares do you consider yourself responsible?—I am responsible for 1,390 shares; and the next step would be, Mr. A. B., who holds those vouchers, would ask me to send him a ticket to sign the transfer book, and to transfer them into A. B.'s name; till that is done I stand as I did originally.

22297. I understand that perfectly?—Then it is my obtuseness, perhaps.

22298. No, it is more likely mine; I want to know, in the event of all being registered?—I only hold 271.

22299. Do you consider the directors are entitled to dispute the transfer?—I apprehend not, unless there is a clause in the Act upon the subject.

22300. Mr. *Thornely.*] You were a director of the company?—Yes, for a certain time.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22301. When you originally subscribed for the 2,000 shares, you paid the call upon the whole of those shares?—Yes; on the 28th of September 1835 I paid 10,000 *l.*

22302. As a deposit?—Yes.

 22303. When

Mr. *I. L. Goldsmid.*

7 June 1837.

22303. When did you cease to be a member of the provisional committee?—Some time in 1836.

22304. Was it in November last?—Mr. Till can mention the date.

Mr. *Till.*] The 21st of November 1836.

22305. Mr. *Vizard.*] You say you sold some of your shares before you ceased to be a director?—Yes.

22306. Were the other directors apprised of your having so sold them?—No, certainly not; I never told anybody of it till to-day.

22307. Or of any of these sales?—I never told any person whatever till to-day.

22308. In signing for 1,390, you say you signed for some persons not responsible; do you mean that they were minors, or persons who could not make themselves responsible?—I mean, supposing it was 20 shares or 50 shares, I did not think that they were persons that the directors might like to take as responsible persons.

22309. Did the directors know anything of it?—No, certainly not; they only knew me.

22310. Are you quite confident, when you directed the sale of the last shares, it was done before you had any knowledge that the Committee had come to a decision in favour of Rennie's Line in preference to Stephenson's?—I did not know it till after I got out of the city, that they had actually come to a decision, and my direction was given long before that; I had given Mr. Ligne the order three or four hours before that.

22311. You did not know of the decision of the Committee till after you left the city, and you gave the direction and they had been sold before you left the city?—Certainly.

22312. If there is anything you wish to have explained and put upon the minutes, if you will point it out to me, I will put the question?—Nothing more than simply this: I should like distinctly to state, that the ground upon which I took an interest in this company, was in consequence of my having property in Brighton, and endeavouring to benefit that property; it was alone with that view I took the shares.

22313. And you have never taken any part in any other company, neither as director or subscriber, or in any other way?—No, I have no concern, directly or indirectly, in any other railway company, and my sole object here was in consequence of having landed property in the county, and I thought it would benefit that property by having a railway connected with it.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Crawshay*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *W. Crawshay.*

22314. Mr. *Alexander.*] WERE you a director of Stephenson's Company?—I am now, and have been since February last year.

22315. For how many shares have you signed the deed?—Fifty and 50.

22316. A hundred in all?—Yes.

22317. At what time did you subscribe the deed?—The first 50 was when the shares were first given out, and I complained to my partner, Mr. Routh, who was a director, I had not sufficient allotted to me; that I wished to have more; and upon my remonstrance, I had 50 more given me.

22318. When did you sign for the last 50?—I cannot tell.

22319. Was it long after the first?—No.

22320. On both occasions you signed before the application to Parliament in 1836?—Yes.

22321. Have you been at any time the holder of more than 100?—I have bought many since.

22322. And sold some?—A few; and I purchased 50 from my partner, Mr. Routh, at the period they were about three and a half or four premium.

22323. Do you recollect the time of the year, and what year?—It was in 1836.

22324. Was it during the progress of the Bill in Parliament, or before it was brought in?—I should think it was while in progress; and I bought shares of sundry other persons whom I do not know, being bought in the market; I bought 460, making 510 in the whole, before I was a director.

22325. Since

22325. Since you have been a director, have you added to your purchases?—Yes, I bought 180.

22326. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Would not that make 560?—No, 510.

22327. Mr. *Alexander.*] That is in addition to the 100 for which your name stands subscribed to the deed?—Fifty and 50, I am a subscriber for; 50 I purchased of Mr. Routh, and 360 of other persons, making 510.

22328. Then the 510 includes the 100 for which your name is subscribed?—Yes.

22329. Since that have you purchased others?—Yes.

22330. What is the largest number you were the holder of at any time?—The largest at any time was 784, but I can explain that to you; that number was made up by the purchase of 60, which I bought in conjunction with four other persons; 15 only were mine, and I transferred 45 of them, leaving 739 shares in my own name, and now my own at this moment.

22331. Were those three speculators with yourself subscribers to the deed?—I do not know; I imagine one is: no, he is not.

22332. Have you any objection to mention who they are?—As they are not my own, I do not see the necessity for it; but one must be a subscriber.

22333. Have you any objection to mention his name?—Robert Moser.

22334. Do you know to what extent he is a subscriber; he appears to have subscribed to the extent of 6,000*l.*; Robert Moser, of Upper Thames-street: is he a partner of yours?—Yes.

22335. Seven hundred and thirty-nine was the largest number you have been proprietor of?—Yes.

22336. How many do you hold of them?—All of them.

22337. When did you purchase the last lot?—About a fortnight or three weeks since.

22338. How many were in that last lot?—Sixty.

22339. What did you purchase just before that?—Thirty-four.

22340. Was there any large quantity purchased between that 34 and the 310 you have given us?—Yes, one purchase of 180.

22341. When was that?—It was a month since; I believe they were purchased of Mr. Goldsmid; it was through a broker, and they were all new ones.

22342. You mentioned them to him this morning?—Yes.

22343. Have you any means of knowing they were his?—No.

22344. There is no name written on them?—None officially; they have been written on since if there are any.

22345. There is none there officially?—No.

22346. Your name is attached to the deed for 100, but you hold 739?—Yes.

22347. Some of them purchased in the market of persons you do not know; some of them purchased jointly with others, and others purchased of your partner, Mr. Routh?—Yes.

22348. Are you a subscriber to the Birmingham and Derby?—Two hundred shares.

22349. To the amount of 20,000*l.*?—Yes.

22350. And the North Midland Company?—One hundred shares.

22351. Is the liability 20,000*l.*?—It must be 200 then.

22352. I believe it to be 20,000*l.*?—Then it is 200 shares; I will tell you why I have forgotten the number.

22353. It is for 20,000*l.*?—Then it is 200 shares.

22354. The London and Cambridge?—Two hundred.

22355. Also 20,000*l.*?—Yes.

22356. And the Brighton 10,000*l.*?—Yes.

22357. All those Bills, with the exception of the Brighton, have become Acts?—Yes, they have.

22358. Will you tell me how many you have registered in the Birmingham and Derby, in pursuance of the Act?—Four hundred I have registered.

22359. You have a larger number than you signed for?—I paid 1*l.* per share in exchange for converting the North Midland into the Birmingham and Derby; the Act for the one at that time being got, and the Act for the other not being got.

22360. Did you effect this by purchase?—By exchanging one scrip for another, with 20*s.* each share.

Mr. *W. Crawshay.*

7 June 1837.

22361. In the Birmingham and Derby you are the holder of 400 shares?—Yes.

22362. Are they all registered?—Yes.

22363. In the North Midland you have not registered any?—No, I exchanged before the Act was obtained, fearful the Act might not be got.

22364. The Act is obtained, but you have no shares registered in it?—No.

22365. How many have you registered in the London and Cambridge?—Not any.

22366. You were a subscriber for 200 shares?—Yes, under the conviction or expectation that the line was to be made from London to Cambridge, with probably a branch to Norwich.

Mr. *Vizard* objected to this evidence, it being in relation to the transactions of another company, which were not matters for inquiry before the Committee, except so far as they related to the responsibility of the Witness.

Mr. *Alexander* was heard in support of the admissibility of the evidence.

Witness.] I have not registered in the London and Cambridge.

22367. Mr. *Thornely.*] Do you wish to assign any reason?—I am quite ready to assign the reason; I did wish to assign the reason; it appears I have embarked in the thing without meaning to carry it out; I embarked in it, intending to invest a certain sum of money in railroads, and that among others.

22368. Mr. *Alexander.*] At all events you signed for 200 shares, and you did not register any in it?—No.

22369. Were you possessed at any time of more than that 200 in the London and Cambridge?—No.

22370. Do you hold any of those, though you have not registered them?—No, not one.

22371. When did you dispose of them?—The moment I heard of the extension of the line.

22372. Can you tell me with relation to the passing of the Act?—It must have been before the passing of the Act; I cannot charge my memory with it positively, but I believe it was.

22373. You sold them before the passing of that Act?—Yes.

22374. Do you consider yourself liable to the calls upon those shares?—I do not; I hope the shares are registered in other persons' names.

22375. Have you any means of compelling the register of those shares?—None whatever.

22376. Are you totally ignorant of the transferees?—Yes, quite; they were sold in the market by my broker.

22377. You consider yourself released from all liability attaching to the signing of the deed?—Except the original deposit.

22378. That was paid?—Yes.

22379. No claim will be made upon you for that?—No, that is impossible, because I paid it myself.

22380. You disposed of those shares before the Act passed?—I think I did.

22381. Then you consider yourself released from all liability attaching to your signature?—I thought so.

22382. Are you a director in any other company?—I am a director in the Midland Counties, but I have never acted or sat.

22383. Are the Midland Counties and the Brighton the only companies in which you are a director?—Yes, except a canal of my own.

22384. Your attention has been a good deal drawn to railroads, from your business and great connexions in the iron trade?—Yes.

22385. And you sold those shares before the Act passed, your consideration being, you had released yourself from all responsibility except the call, which was paid?—Yes.

22386. At what time did you effect this transfer between the Birmingham and Derby, and the North Midland?—Prior to the passing of the North Midland Act.

22387. Did you consider yourself released from all liability when you transferred those shares?—I did.

22388. Did you consider that the person from whom you got the 200 shares in

in the Birmingham and Derby, got rid of his responsibility, and that you became liable?—Yes, upon the same principle.

22389. Was the transfer of the shares between the Birmingham and Derby, and North Midland, before either Act was obtained?—No, the Birmingham and Derby was obtained, the North Midland was not.

22390. Since that the North Midland has been got?—Yes.

22391. Do you consider you have a claim upon the directors in the Brighton Company to be registered for those shares you have purchased, suppose the Act should become law?—Unquestionably; that is my impression.

22392. Is your impression generally upon the subject, that the directors have not the power to refuse any person?—It is a mere matter of opinion, to which my thoughts were never drawn before; that is my opinion, certainly.

22393. Your attention has been much directed to the subject of canals, and things of that kind?—Yes; I consider if anybody presents one of these scrips, and demands to be registered as a shareholder, and no claim was made upon him for a payment which he refuses, he is entitled to be a shareholder; that is my opinion.

22394. If any claim was made upon him which he acceded to, he would still be entitled?—No doubt.

22395. Was it under the impression that that was the law and the practice, that you have bought and sold, and trafficked in the shares in the manner you have told the Committee?—Yes, it was.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22396. I believe you are no lawyer?—No.

22397. And therefore do not pretend to give a very accurate opinion upon the construction of the deed or the Act of Parliament?—I only give the opinion under which I acted.

22398. Your impression?—Yes.

22399. You have not read the Act to see what the clauses are?—Certainly not.

22400. It is hardly necessary to ask, though I should like to have it upon the minutes; you have been asked the number of shares you have subscribed, are you fully competent to meet the liabilities upon those shares you hold?—Yes, I hope so.

22401. Mr. Moser's name has been mentioned; have you any doubt of his competency to meet his liabilities upon the shareholders?—Not the slightest in the world, from my knowledge of his capital in the house in which I am a partner.

22402. Have you been applied to, to register your shares in the London and Cambridge?—No, I have not.

22403. Do you know whether the shares formerly held by you have been registered in other names?—I made an inquiry, and the answer was, that 105 shares of the 200 I sold, have been registered; I made the inquiry lately.

22404. When was it you were apprised that a number of your shares were registered in the London and Cambridge?—Six weeks or two months since.

22405. For aught you know, all the rest may have been registered since?—Yes, for I never made any inquiry but that one.

Re-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

22406. You say you have not been called upon to register?—No.

22407. Have you not seen the advertisement calling upon persons to come in and register?—I was not a holder.

22408. Have you not seen that advertisement?—I do not know that I have.

22409. Is it not usual?—I had, in consequence of a conversation with my partner, Mr. Routh, who had some knowledge upon the subject, heard that an application was made to him to register.

22410. Do you not know there was a general application to persons to come in?—No, I do not, except from that gentleman.

22411. You say you have learned that 105 of your shares are registered; how can you trace them?—I only asked the question.

22412. Of whom?—Mr. Rowcroft.

22413. The

Mr. *W. Crawshay.*

7 June 1837.

22413. The clerk of the company?—Yes.

22414. Is there any means by which they can be traced?—I suppose so, or he would not have given me that answer.

22415. Is there any name upon the scrip?—No.

22416. You do not yourself know that those shares were yours except what Mr. Rowcroft told you?—I knew it from looking over the book with Mr. Rowcroft.

22417. Have you kept a memorandum of the numbers of those shares?—No.

22418. How did he know?—The scrip are numbered.

22419. Have you kept a memorandum of the numbers?—No; but the original numbers are appropriated. For instance, my name was No. 1 to No. 200; those numbers, when they are registered, must be marked off to the person in whose name they are, and I think I can show that that was the case in the London and Cambridge.

22420. That would enable the persons at the office to trace the shares; but could you trace those shares now registered to the extent of 105 as being yours?—In no other way except through the book.

22421. You do not know the persons in whose names they are registered?—No.

22422. You do not know whether they are solvent or insolvent?—No.

22423. Mr. *Vizard.*] Do not the certificates contain numbers pointing out the numbers of the shares you hold?—Yes, the scrip all contain numbers.

22424. When you went to the book of the London and Cambridge you found that the book specified the number of shares delivered to you?—Yes.

22425. Not only the number taken, but each number?—Yes.

22426. Having this information from your own certificates, and going to the book, is there any difficulty in connecting the purchasers of the shares with the original holders?—None.

22427. Supposing it has passed through 40 hands, if the last holder carries his certificates to the book, the certificates showing what the numbers were, has he any difficulty in finding out the original holder?—Not the least.

22428. Mr. *Thornely.*] You have stated you were extensively engaged in the iron trade?—Yes.

22429. From the extension of railways you promised yourself great benefit?—Yes; and we have in the iron trade experienced very great advantage from it.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Lewis Michael Simon*, was called in.

Mr. *L. M. Simon.*

Mr. *Vizard* stated that Mr. Simon being a stockbroker, he should object to his being asked about any transactions in which he had been employed for other persons, they being purely of a confidential nature.

Mr. *Alexander* stated that Mr. Vizard had better wait till some question was put to which an objection arose.

The Witness was then Examined, as follows:

22430. Mr. *Alexander.*] YOU are a stockbroker?—Yes; but it is my intention not to state anything I have done for anybody else. As far as I am individually concerned, and as far as anything I have had to do in Brighton shares, I should have great pleasure in affording any information to the Committee; but as regards other persons I hope the Committee will not require it, as it would be a breach of duty, and, let the consequences be what they might, I could not answer it.

22431. Are you a subscriber to the deed for Stephenson's Line?—Yes, I am.

22432. To what extent?—Fifty-five shares, I believe.

22433. Are you not a subscriber in more than one place?—I do not know; if I had been told before I would have looked into it.

22434. Are those your own shares?—They were.

22435. Do you hold any of them now?—Of those identical shares none.

22436. Do you hold any others?—Yes, I hold 45 at this moment.

22437. How long have you had those 45?—I should think a month or six weeks, or two months; I would have been prepared with the dates if I had known the object of the questions.

22438. Was it in the month of April you purchased them, or did you purchase them?—Yes.

22439. In

22439. In the market?—Yes.

22440. For yourself?—Yes.

22441. You think it was about six weeks ago?—Yes.

22442. Will you tell the Committee when you disposed of the 55 shares you subscribed the deed for?—I cannot tell the dates, but I can produce them.

22443. About when was it?—Very soon after the shares were distributed at a small premium.

22444. Do you mean in the autumn of 1835?—Yes; Mr. Till knows the time.

22445. How does Mr. Till happen to know the time you disposed of your shares?—He does not know that; I asked him the time they were distributed.

22446. Did you sell the whole of the 55 shares at once?—I think not.

22447. Did you sell them all within short intervals of each other?—Yes.

22448. And all at a premium?—Yes.

22449. Then, from the autumn of 1835, till six weeks ago, you were not the holder of any shares in this company?—I do not engage to say that; I may have bought shares and sold some in the meantime.

22450. Can you state whether you did or not?—I cannot say positively; I can tell you to-morrow.

22451. I am speaking of shares you bought for yourself?—Yes, of course.

22452. Did you traffic in shares in Stephenson's Line between the autumn of 1835 to six weeks ago?—Yes, no doubt I have bought and sold them again.

22453. Did you retain any of those you bought for any considerable length of time?—Not very long, I dare say.

22454. You say you sold those 55 shares soon after they were allotted; were they originally allotted to you?—That I am not quite sure of.

22455. Or did you purchase letters of appropriation?—I am not sure whether they were originally allotted to me; I know I paid the deposit and signed the deed.

22456. You may have done that upon letters of appropriation you purchased; such things are sold?—Not in this instance.

22457. Were letters of appropriation of shares sold?—I believe not; I should think not.

22458. You do not know?—I should say distinctly not; in this case there were none.

22459. *Chairman.*] Can you say positively there were not?—Yes.

22460. Mr. *Alexander.*] How did you become possessed of 55 shares?—If they were not originally allotted to me, I am not certain whether it was 45 or 55, I bought them in the market.

22461. I understand you have signed the deed for 55 shares, and it was very shortly after they were issued?—I signed the deed before they were issued. I could not sign the deed till I paid the deposit.

22462. Not before the allotment was made?—No.

22463. You sold them very shortly after you got them?—Yes.

22464. Then do I understand you have signed the deed for any you bought in the market?—I will assume I had 45 allotted to me; then the other 10 shares, supposing it was so, I should have bought in the market, and I should have taken the banker's receipt to the office, and I should have got myself inscribed for 55 shares.

22465. Would not the person to whom the banker's receipt had been sold have signed the deed?—No, he only signs the deed previous to exchanging.

22466. The banker's receipts were sold in the market if the letters of appropriation were not?—I really cannot recollect; I should almost think they were; we were dealing largely in hundreds of other companies.

22467. Mr. *Vizard*, to Mr. *Till.*] How many were allotted to Mr. Simon?—Fifty-five: he paid the deposit of 275*l.* October the 2d, and the shares were delivered October the 15th to Mr. Simon himself, and he signed the deed no doubt the same day, and certainly before the shares were put into his hands.

22468. Mr. *Clarkson*, to Mr. *Simon.*] You are an original subscriber for 55 shares?—Yes.

22469. You do not recollect the exact time after you got them that you sold them?—No, I do not.

Mr. *L. M. Simon.*

7 June 1837.

22470. I mean, within how many days?—No, I have not the slightest recollection whether it was a fortnight or a month.

22471. Do you recollect the state of the market?—About 3*l.* premium.

22472. Do you recollect the state of the market at the time you bought those you now hold?—They cost me about 2*l.* a share.

22473. Have the shares in Stephenson's Line been in the market between the time of their coming to the House for an Act and the determination of the Committee upon the subject, like all other companies?—Yes.

22474. Have they been the subject of purchase and sale?—Every day.

22475. To a great extent?—Yes, to a great extent.

22476. Do you consider yourself responsible to the directors of Stephenson's Line, in the event of their obtaining the Act, for the 55 shares you have sold, and for which you have signed the deed?—

The *Chairman* suggested that this was a question turning upon the legal construction of the deed.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated the object of the question.

22477. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you consider yourself responsible for any portion of the 55 shares?—I imagine I am bound for what I have signed till the Act is obtained; I am no lawyer.

22478. After the Act is obtained, supposing it to be obtained, is it the opinion of the house, of which you are a very respectable member, that the parties who originally signed this deed are responsible?—I should presume it depends upon the Act of Parliament; I am unable to answer the question.

22479. When you parted with your shares, you parted with them upon uncertainty of what the Act might enact?—I knew what I considered my liability; I considered myself liable for 5,500*l.*

22480. Did you consider that your liability would cease upon the passing of the Act?—I never considered it much.

22481. Did you part with your shares without considering whether you should or not remain liable after the Act passed?—I did not consider I was liable after the Act passed.

22482. And upon that consideration, you parted with the shares?—Yes.

22483. For those which you shall hold, at the time the Act passes, you will consider yourself liable, if the Act ever passes, if you apply to register them?—Yes.

22484. If you do not apply to register them, you do not consider yourself liable?—Not upon the scrip.

22485. Can you tell me whether that is prevailing doctrine upon the Stock Exchange?—I do not know.

22486. Was there a time at which you were not a proprietor of any shares?—Yes.

22487. Can you give the Committee a notion of the extent of your dealings in Stephenson's shares?—For other persons, or myself?

22488. The extent of your dealings for yourself and others, whose names I do not at present ask?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to inquiries in to the transactions of the Witness for other persons, he being employed by them as their confidential broker.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated his object was to ascertain the extent of the trafficking in shares, while the Act was in progress.

The *Committee* decided that the question might be asked as to the amount of the dealings of the Witness generally for himself and others.

Witness.] For myself they have been very small indeed; for others very large; large, I would not say very large.

22489. Some thousands of shares?—Not thousands.

22490. *Chairman.*] Since the shares first came out to the present period?—As a rude guess, I should say, a thousand shares bought and sold.

22491. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you mean bought a thousand and sold a thousand, as a rude guess, during the whole period?—I have certainly bought 500 and sold 500.

22492. *Chairman.*] In any one week, what has been the number?—

22493. Mr. *Clarkson.*]

22493. Mr. *Clarkson.*] In the week preceding the determination of the Committee upon the subject of the engineering matter of Stephenson's Line, can you tell us the number?—

Mr. *Vizard* suggested whether the Witness was not giving information prejudicial to those who had confidentially employed him.

The *Chairman* stated that professional communications were considered privileged, but he never understood that these transactions were to be considered privileged communications.

Mr. *Vizard* stated that the Witness had already said he should decline to answer the questions.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated that the Witness had refused to answer a question totally different.

The *Chairman* stated that it was a matter of discretion for the counsel how far he would press the question, but, as a matter of opinion upon the dry point, he (the Chairman) was not aware that this could be considered a privileged communication.

22494. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Will you be so good as to tell the Committee whether, upon any one occasion, you ever disposed of in the market as many as 600 shares?—Never, by any chance.

22495. Will you inform the Committee whether upon any occasion, in the course of any week, you disposed of as many shares as that?—I should say decidedly not.

22496. Can you with convenience tell us now what number of shares, to the best of your judgment, is the gross amount you may have disposed of, in any one week, in Stephenson's Line; I do not want to know for whom?—I am so entirely unfurnished with any note upon the subject, I cannot tell; if you had furnished me with a hint yesterday, I would have been prepared; I should say I have never bought more than 300, or sold more than 300, in any one week.

22497. Now, be so good as to attend to the question I am about to put to you; I do not ask you the private transactions of any person; are you the broker of Mr. Crawshay?—I am not; I have not that honour.

22498. Are you the broker of Mr. Routh?—I must decline answering any question of that kind.

Chairman.] You must state whether you are the broker of Mr. Crawshay or Mr. Routh.

22499. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Are you the broker of Mr. Routh; you need not answer it unless you like?—I decline to answer.

22500. Are you the broker of Mr. Goldsmid?—I must decline answering any question as to the parties employing me.

22501. You decline answering whether you are the broker of Mr. Goldsmid or Mr. Routh?—That is not quite my answer; I decline answering as to whom I am broker for.

22502. You have not done it in every instance; you have given it the negative?—I did in one instance.

22503. Are you the broker of Mr. Jones?—I beg to refer to the answer I have given.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, he proposed to ask the Witness whether he had any objection to tell the Committee whether, upon any particular date, he had any transactions in Stephenson's shares on behalf of any of the provisional committee of the company, and though he did not admit the Witness was not bound to answer the question, he should not press it if he declined to answer it.

22504. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you any objection to tell the Committee whether upon any particular day or days, and when, you had any transactions in Stephenson's shares, as broker to any of the gentlemen who are upon the provisional committee of that company?—I do object to answer it.

22504.* I take it for granted you would object to tell me whether those dealings, if there were such, were advantageous or otherwise to those gentlemen?—I refer to the answer I have given.

22505. Can you tell us whether the shares were ever as high as 15 premium?—Yes, higher.

Mr. *L. M. Simon.*

7 June 1837.

22506. They were in the list 17 ¾?—Seventeen or 18; I think 18.

22507. Will your experience tell me what they were a month ago?—At a discount.

22508. Now they are at a greater discount?—About the same; perhaps I may add, I bought a great many shares at a very high premium.

22509. For yourself?—No.

22510. I have no objection to your adding that, if you will tell me for whom?—I cannot do that.

22511. Have you sold a great many at a very high premium?—Not near so many as I have bought.

22512. Have you the means of ascertaining the amount respectively of each?—Yes, certainly.

22513. Will you have the goodness to let us have it to-morrow?—Very well.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22514. You say that you believe that you may have bought and sold, from first to last, about 1,000 shares; is that founded upon any accurate recollection, or merely a loose guess?—Not at all; I said it was a mere rude guess.

22515. Does the same apply to your other statement, that you may have bought and sold to the number of 300 in one week?—About 300 at the outside.

22516. I will ask you this general question, whether these shares were or not in greater estimation in the market than any other shares where the Act had not been passed?—Certainly, I do not know any that bore so high a premium.

22517. May I ask whether that proceeded from the confidence the public had in the directors and the concern itself?—I conceive it arose from the great confidence they had in the provisional committee, and from the parties who it was generally known held the shares.

22518. Do you know, or, in the course of your experience on the Stock Exchange, did you ever discover, or have you any reason to believe that any unusual means were resorted to by any one individual, or by any one of the committee, to enhance the value of the shares?—Certainly not.

Mr. *Richard Lambert Jones,* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *R. L. Jones.*

22519. Mr. *Clarkson.*] ARE you a subscriber to this deed?—I am.

22520. For 12 shares?—A great many more than that; 172 shares; it is in two places in the deed.

22521. Did you sign the deed once or more than once?—Twice.

22522. Did you not sign it three times?—Yes; 22, 50 and 100.

22523. Were they your own shares?—Yes.

22524. All of them?—Yes; I signed also for other parties; it stands in the name of a lady in Worcestershire and Henry Ricketts.

22525. That is in the other deed?—No, in the same deed.

22526. Those three, the signatures are your own?—Yes; but I have signed for four individuals, a clergyman's widow in Worcestershire and Mr. Nash.

22527. *Chairman.*] By procuration?—No, by letter.

22528. It is stated in the deed you signed for another party?—Yes.

22529. Mr. *Clarkson.*] In the other cases, when you signed for others, you so stated it?—Yes.

22530. You signed three times; how does it happen all three follow each other in this list?—They do not in the deed.

22531. Did it arise from your disposition to take shares at one time and then at another?—It was from the opinion I had of them.

22532. And you subscribed the deed for 172 shares?—Yes, besides the others I signed for other parties.

22533. Are you one of the directors of this company?—One of the provisional committee.

22534. In other words, a director till the Act passes?—Yes.

22535. Have you any of those shares now?—Yes.

22536. How many?—Fifty.

22537. Of the same shares for which you originally subscribed?—No.

22538. Have

22538. Have you any of the shares for which you originally subscribed?—Thirty.

22539. From which you have never parted?—From which I have never parted.

22540. When did you purchase the 20?—I should think it was within this month or six weeks.

22541. Since this Committee has been sitting?—Yes.

22542. When did you first sell any portion of the 170 for which you subscribed the deed?—I should think it was about May or June 1836; it was about that time.

22543. Do you recollect when it was the Bill was stopped last session?—In August.

22544. How long was it before that?—Some time before that.

22545. You recollect it?—Yes; some considerable time before that, certainly.

22546. Did you dispose of them all to one person?—No.

22547. Did you dispose of them in the market?—No; I sold some through a broker, and some I parted with to a friend. I gave a friend some, indeed; and a very respectable individual too.

22548. Such as you sold through the broker; were they sold at a premium?—Yes.

22549. All that you sold?—No; I sold a great many at a discount.

22550. When?—After the Bill was thrown out last year; and this year I sold at a discount.

22551. I am afraid you could not sell in any other way?—Yes, I might, some day; I sold at two discount and one discount.

22552. Were you aware at the time you sold your shares that the deed you had subscribed refused to recognize, on the part of the subscribers, any transfer of shares before the Act passed?—No.

22553. If you had been aware of it should you have transferred your shares while that provision remained in the deed?—I considered myself, at the time I signed the deed, that I was liable, unless the directors chose to release me by accepting another person.

22554. That is not an answer to the question; you told me you were not aware of the clause in the deed that the subscribers would not recognize the transfer of shares before the passing of the Act?—I was not aware of it; but I was aware before any share was issued, from Mr. Vizard, that every subscriber to that deed was liable, and his property, unless he was released by the directors by the substitution of another person.

22555. By registering the shares?—Yes; or any other mode.

22556. Did you know that that proviso was in the deed; never mind what Mr. Vizard told you?—I did not recollect that such a proviso was in the deed.

22557. Were you ever aware that there was such a proviso in the deed?—No; but I knew my liability.

22558. You knew what Mr. Vizard told you was your liability?—Yes; and I knew the common sense of it.

22559. When you disposed of any of your shares in the market, you were not aware you were a subscriber to the deed with such a proviso in it?—No; I was aware of the liability.

22560. Were you aware you were a subscriber to a deed in which you expressed your disinclination to recognize the transfer of shares before the Act passed?—I can give no other answer than I have; I hold myself responsible.

22561. If you had known there was that proviso, should you have sold your shares in the market?—I should have perhaps paused before I did so.

22562. Why should you have paused?—I should have the same view of it as to my responsibility.

22563. Why should you have paused?—I should have considered whether that interpretation would have prevented my selling; the interpretation of one person's mind may be one way, and another another.

22564. Have you purchased any other shares in the market besides those you have subscribed for?—Twenty.

22565. Any others?—No.

22566. Through whom did you sell, when you sold?—Through Mr. Hutchinson.

22567. *Chairman.*] Is he a broker?—Yes.

Mr. *R. L. Jones.*

7 June 1837.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22568. You say you signed the deed for other parties; do you know whether that was a separate deed, distinct from the original contract?—I believe it was.

22569. There were two sorts of deeds?—Yes.

22570. That was explained to you at the time?—Yes; and that if necessary, the parties must be called upon to sign the original document.

22571. It was used as a matter of convenience?—Yes.

[The Witness withdrew.

William Vizard, Esq., made the following statement:

W. Vizard, Esq.

I was asked yesterday to produce my tickets, in order to show whether they were original shares, I have brought them with me for that purpose.

22572. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Be so good as to read the numbers?—7,316 to 7,320 five shares; 7,321 to 7,325.

22573. Are they original shares?—Mr. Till tells me they are original shares issued to me; they are the tickets of original shares.

22574. *Chairman.*] Is there any further explanation you have to offer?—I said I had sold some of these shares and bought some in the London and Cambridge, and I sold again; I think I said that those latter transactions of mine produced no profit to me, rather a loss. It has been stated that a circular was sent round, signed in the name of myself and my partner, announcing the distribution of shares; I wish to state we had nothing whatever to do with the distribution; I never knew to whom the distribution was made, or by whom made; the letter was lithographed, and I think our names lithographed also; it was only used because we were solicitors to the company, and there was no secretary.

22575. Who did distribute the shares?—I do not know; it was done among the provisional committee, to which we were no parties; certainly, not myself; and my partner tells me had nothing to do with it. With a view to some of the questions put to me as to my liability, I should wish to state, that these shares show there is no difficulty in tracing the shares, and I am, therefore, not imposing upon any parties who purchased shares from me, because the holder of the shares, through whatever hands they may have passed has no difficulty in going to the book and finding that I am the person to whom he is to look to make the transfer.

22576. Mr. *Thornely.*] Because every share is numbered?—Any man producing these tickets, can ascertain from Mr. Till that they were issued to Mr. Vizard, and Mr. Vizard is the person to make the transfer.

22577. *Chairman.*] Whether before or after the Act, the number being attached to each share, you have only to have recourse to the books of the company, to show to whom the shares were first issued?—Yes; every man purchasing in the market can trace by whom the transfer is to be made. The former Act prescribes that the transfer shall be made when required by any party presenting himself, the deposits and the calls up to that time having been paid, so that any purchaser under me could compel me to make the transfer, and compel me to pay the calls to enable me so to transfer, supposing he was not to apply till after a call had been made under the Act of Parliament.

22578. Mr. *Brotherton.*] Would the register of the numbers under the Act of Parliament be the same as the numbers in the certificate?—The register is not made up till after the Act has passed; and there may be new numbers, but the Act prescribes that a certificate shall be given under the common seal in exchange for those certificates, and the person presenting those certificates would be entitled to be registered, all calls having been paid; that is, if the original holder came and claimed to have his assignee registered; that is the effect of the Bill, and I believe in that respect this Bill is like all other Bills relating to this subject.

22579. *Chairman.*] Is there any other point you have to mention?—A good deal has been said about the value of these shares in the market; I should wish to state one circumstance that very much contributed to that, the provisional committee for promoting this line——

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to Mr. Vizard making the statement he was about to make.

The *Chairman* stated, that it was a mere matter of opinion, and that it was not worth while to go into it.

22580. Mr.

W. Vizard, Esq.

7 June 1837.

22580. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You have told me just now you had some shares in the London and Cambridge?—Yes.

22581. How many?—I do not recollect.

22582. About how many?—To my belief 50, but I do not know.

22583. May they have been more?—Yes, they may.

22584. Twice as many?—I cannot tell whether it is 50 or 100; I know they gave me some shares, and I know I hold more shares than I took originally; I know that the shares are at a discount.

22585. They gave you some shares?—They allotted me some shares; that is what I mean by giving, upon which I paid the deposit.

22586. Did you apply for them?—I think I did.

22587. Do you believe you did?—I have not the least doubt of it; I have no recollection whether the directors said there are so many shares for you, or whether I asked for them.

22588. Have you registered for them?—I think I have; upon further consideration, I know I have.

22589. For every one you held?—I know I am registered for more than they originally allotted to me.

22590. Have you registered for the shares originally allotted to you?—I have no doubt it is the same individual shares; I know I have registered for more, and I have no doubt it is for the same shares.

Mr. *Leonard Redmayne*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *L. Redmayne.*

22591. Mr. *Clarkson.*] DID you subscribe Stephenson's deed?—Yes, I did.

22592. You are described in the deed as of 176, Oxford-street, upholsterer?—I was residing there at the time I subscribed it; but I am also resident in Lancaster.

22593. Are you a partner in the respectable house, known by the name of Gillow & Co.?—Yes.

22594. Were you an applicant for shares in Stephenson's Line?—Not directly myself, but at the time they were taken I was a director of the Lancaster bank, and they were taken by my brother directors in my name, for several persons who had accounts with the bank.

22595. *Chairman.*] They were taken by your brother directors in the Lancaster bank?—Yes.

22596. Was it in pursuance of orders from those parties who banked with the Lancaster bank?—Yes, by the orders of the customers of the bank.

22597. Mr. *Clarkson.*] To how many different persons did the shares belong?—I really cannot recollect, for I have had no communication since upon the subject since I signed the deed.

22598. After you signed the deed, you paid the deposit?—It was paid.

22599. Did you pay it?—No, it was paid by the Lancaster bank.

22600. Not by yourself?—No.

22601. Did you take any papers with you when you signed the deed?—No, a party called upon me at my own place to subscribe the deed.

22602. What party?—I do not think I should recollect the gentleman who called upon me.

22603. The name affixed as the subscribing witness is Henry Leman; is that the gentleman there [*pointing to Mr. Leman*]?—No.

Mr. *Leman.*] It is my brother; he went by my direction; he shall attend the Chairman when you please.

22604. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Some person called upon you with the deed, and you subscribed it?—Yes.

22605. You produce no banker's receipt?—No, I might produce the letter of the directors, with a request that I would sign it; I probably might.

22606. Where did you get that from?—From Lancaster.

22607. Was it directed from the bank at Lancaster?—Yes, to myself.

22608. *Chairman.*] That was a letter signifying to you that certain shares had been allotted?—Yes, it was; and that I should be expected to subscribe to the deed.

22609. Mr. *Clarkson.*] It was a letter from the directors of the undertaking?—No, from the directors of the Lancaster bank.

Mr. *L Redmayne.*

7 June 1837.

22610. Directing you to subscribe the deed?—Yes.

22611. But you received no letter from Stephenson's company, requesting you to sign the deed?—I am not aware that I did.

22612. When you subscribed the deed, did you tell the gentlemen before whom you subscribed it, that you signed it for the gentlemen at the Lancaster bank?—I cannot tell whether I did or not; I presume I did.

22613. At all events, you produced the letter from the gentleman at the Lancaster bank?—I cannot charge my memory, but I presume I did so; but since that period I have had no communication upon the subject.

22614. Did you receive, upon your subscription of the deed, any scrip of any kind?—No, I did not.

22615. Were you the party who had applied to the company or the provisional direction for shares to be allotted to you?—Not directly; but as a director with the other directors, I might be considered as applying.

22616. There was an application made by the directors of the Lancaster bank for shares, of which direction you were one, and those shares were for the customers of that bank?—Yes, several persons.

22617. Did you at any time receive the scrip?—No, I have never received any communication whatever since that period.

22618. *Chairman.*] You signed in your own name and not as one of the firm?—Yes, I signed my own name at my residence.

22619. Is that a joint-stock bank?—Yes.

22620. Mr. *Thornely.*] Did the letter of the directors make any statement to you as to the payment of deposits?—I cannot recollect; I have not the letter with me, and I have been residing since at Lancaster; the letter is there now, but I should think the letter would mention the deposit.

22621. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Am I to understand that you yourself never held scrip for the value of 11,000 *l.*, for which you signed the deed?—I never had any shares myself at all.

22622. And never received any vouchers for shares?—I believe not.

22623. When was it you subscribed the deed?—I think it might be in June or July last year; I cannot be certain as to the period.

22624. Were you asked, at the time you signed the deed, by anybody whether you were the person that held the shares?—I do not recollect that question being asked me.

22625. Was any question asked you, or were you merely asked to sign the deed?—I was asked to sign the deed as having had a certain number of shares allotted to me.

22626. *Chairman.*] Was it inquired of you, previous to your signing, whether the deposits had been paid?—No, there was no such question put to me.

22627. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you reason to believe that the deposits were paid before or after that time?—I have not the least doubt but that they had been paid; I am not certain of it, but I have not the least doubt of it.

22628. What has become of those shares you do not know?—No, I have had no communication since.

22629. Who has them, or how many hands they have gone through, you do not know?—No.

22630. Mr. *Thornely.*] Are you aware whether the directors of the joint-stock bank in Lancaster ever received the certificates of those shares, and distributed them to the persons for whom they were subscribed?—I should presume they have, but I have seen nothing of them.

22631. Have you seen any correspondence of your secretary since that upon the subject?—No; I have been chiefly resident here since that period.

22632. *Chairman.*] Do you know to what extent you have made yourself liable?—Yes, I was aware of that.

22633. What was your opinion of your liability?—That they were for 100 *l.* shares.

22634. Did you understand that you became liable for that amount?—I was aware I was then liable for the amount subscribed for.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22635. You are a partner in this bank?—In the Lancaster bank.

22636. Did you apply for the shares, or did the bank apply for them?—The bank applied for them.

22637. And

Mr. *L. Redmayne.*

7 June 1837.

22637. And you, as one of the partners in the bank, were requested to sign the deed?—Yes; I was then residing in London.

22638. Were you aware by so doing you undertook a personal liability yourself?—Yes, I was aware of that.

22639. You have not received any scrip?—No.

22640. Do you remember authorizing a Mr. Forster to receive the scrip for you?—Mr. Forster would receive it.

22641. Was he the broker of the house?—Yes.

22642. You say it was last spring you signed the deed?—Last June or July.

22643. Trace in your recollection whether it was not the October preceding; the actual date is the 5th of October?—I am not aware of the date exactly.

22644. *Chairman.*] From the books of the company what appears to be the date?—

Mr. *Till.*] The deposit was paid to Messrs. Williams & Deacon, October the 5th 1835, and the shares were delivered October 23d, and Mr. Redmayne must have signed the deed previous to those shares being delivered out.

22645. You mean from the manner in which the business was conducted?—Yes.

Re-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

22646. Does the letter which announced to the company the desire of the directors of the Lancaster bank to take shares, communicate to them that the shares were for their customers?—I did not see the letter that communicated it to them.

22647. But that was the fact?—Yes.

22648. You have no interest in the shares?—No.

22649. Was it the fact that the shares were applied for by the directors of the Lancaster bank on their own behalf or for their customers?—For their customers.

22650. Had the directors of the Lancaster bank any interest in it?—None that I know of.

22651. Mr. *Vizard.*] Do you know whether any of the parties connected with the railway company were apprised of it, that the shares asked for by the bank, and at their request put in your name, were for the use of their customers?—I do not think that would be named to the railway company; I should think it was not.

[The Witness withdrew.

Thomas Webber, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Thomas Webber.

22652. Mr. *Clarkson.*] ARE you one of the messengers in the South-Eastern Railway Company's Office?—Yes, I am.

22653. Have you inquired after a gentleman of the name of Arthur Savage, described in the deed as of 168, Fleet-street, gentleman?—One hundred and sixty-eight; yes.

22654. A gentleman, described in the deed as having signed it twice for 1,500 *l.* each time; is there any such person living at 168, Fleet-street?—No, there is not.

22655. Who is living at 168, Fleet-street?—I cannot say what the person's name is living there, but it is a chemist and druggist's.

22656. To whom did you address your inquiry?—To a gentleman in that establishment.

22657. To the chemist and druggist?—Yes.

22658. What answer did you get from him when you asked for Mr. Savage?—That no such gentleman lived there.

22659. Did you hear how long the gentleman you found there had lived there?—Yes.

22660. How long had he lived there?—Many years.

22661. Did he know such a gentleman as Arthur Savage?—Yes.

22662. Did he tell you who he was?—He did not know anything of him.

22663. I asked you if he knew such a person?—He knew such a person, but he did not know anything of him.

22664. Have the goodness to render that into English?—He did not know anything about him.

Thomas Webber.

7 June 1837.

22665. *Chairman.*] He did not know anything of his character and pursuits? —Yes, that is what I mean.

22666. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Had he lived in that house?—A twelvemonth back he had.

22667. Did you learn what business he had carried on there?—They did not know what business.

22668. Did he lodge there?—Yes.

22669. Was there any person from whom you could obtain information who Mr. Savage was?—No.

22670. Have you inquired after another person, in the Kingsland-road, described here as C. P. Marie de Buck, 9, Kingsland-road?—Yes.

22671. Could you find out anything about him?—No; no such person lived there.

22672. What shop is No. 9, Kingsland-road?—A glass warehouse.

22673. Did you learn whether such a person had lived there in the last two or three years?—No person of that name had lived there for many years.

22674. Do you know of any other No. 9 but that?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22675. You say that Mr. Savage has signed the deed twice; what is your authority for saying that?—

Mr. *Clarkson.* The printed list.

22676. Mr. *Vizard.*] You learned that Mr. Savage lived there a year ago?—Yes.

22677. *Chairman*, to Mr. *Till.*] Do you know anything about a Mr. C. P. Marie de Buck?—Yes, he is a partner in the house of Lemmé, No. 1, Finsbury Circus.

22678. Mr. *Vizard.*] What are they?—Mediterranean merchants.

22679. Of great respectability?—Yes; I do not know why he is described as of Kingsland-road; he is described in these books as of No. 1, Finsbury Circus; here it is in the deed, John Lemmé, gent.; and then Mr. de Buck describes himself as of No. 9, Kingsland-road; Kingsland-road is a large place. I know him to be one of the most respectable men in the city of London; he must know his own residence, I suppose.

[The Witness withdrew.

The *Chairman* stated, unless these cases could be proved to an amount to reduce the subscription list below the 50 per cent., it was hardly worth while to go into this inquiry.

Mr. *Till* stated, that it appeared that Mr. Savage signed the deed in September 1835.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, he should not trouble the Committee with any more witnesses, and proceeded to observe upon the evidence which had been adduced in support of the petition for which he appeared.

Mr. *Vizard* requested that Mr. Leman might be examined, in order to remove any doubt that might exist in the minds of the Committee with regard to the deposit of the deed, executed by the parties who signed by procuration.

Mr. *James Leman*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. James Leman.

22680. *Chairman.*] DID you deposit in the Private Bill Office the deed containing the signatures of the parties who signed by procuration?—Yes, I did.

22681. When?—I forget the precise day; I think it was in December last; the deed was quadruple; there were four copies, and they were all tied together, making in truth one packet, and the committee clerk gave me only a receipt as for one deed, but there were four deeds tied together precisely in the same way as I deposited it in the session of 1835.

22682. Mr. *Vizard.*] Were they in that shape produced before the Standing Order Committee?—I believe they were.

22683. *Chairman.*] You believe that that deed, with the others, was produced?—Yes; I am wrong in the date; the deposit was in February, before the petition for the Bill was presented; that is required by the Standing Orders.

Cross-

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson*.

Mr. *James Leman*.

7 June 1837.

22684. Was anybody with you when you deposited it?—Mr. Heyward, the Parliamentary agent.

22685. Who tied them up?—I did myself.

22686. Where at?—In Lincoln's Inn Fields; my stationer copied them, and to show there was no mistake, four copies were made.

22687. Did you read the receipt you received?—I do not know that a receipt was given; I saw the entry in the book.

22688. I thought you said when he gave the receipt it was for one deed?—It was given to Mr. Heyward.

22689. Are you quite certain you were the hand that deposited the deed with the clerk?—Yes, I am.

22690. Who was the clerk?—I think his name was Thompson, and, in confirmation of what I have said, he said he received four deeds.

22691. He said that?—Yes, and without my making inquiry; the moment I saw the print without that deed, I directed inquiries to be made at the Private Bill Office, and that long before this petition was presented; I directed inquiries to be made, and I learned it was lost between the Private Bill Office and the printer's.

22692. Was that copy on parchment or paper?—Upon paper, in this form. *(Brief form.)*

22693. Did you examine it yourself before the deposit?—No.

22694. Who did?—A clerk in my office.

22695. How long before?—A day or two before.

22696. Mr. *Vizard*.] It appears now that all the papers are lost?—They are all lost. It occurred to me, when I saw the print without that deed, that the House of Commons had considered that that deed by procuration was not a deed that came within the Parliamentary directions, and therefore it was omitted.

22697. Did you ever see the four deeds after you say you deposited them in the Private Bill Office?—Never.

22698. Or any of them?—No; I think I must have seen them externally in the Committee upon the Bill.

22699. When you were in the Committee upon the Bill, were the four copies produced there?—They ought to have been.

22700. Did you see them?—No; I understood they were brought every day by the Committee clerk.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that he thought it very likely that the casualty alluded to by Mr. Leman had occurred with respect to the deed signed by procuration, and he therefore should not insist upon the point he had raised with respect to that deed.

Mr. *Vizard* was heard to observe upon the evidence which had been produced in support of the petition of J. S. Yeats.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

No. 1.—Petition of James Sebastian Yeats, 17 May 1837 - - - - p. 51

No. 2.—Petition of Provisional Committee, 18 May 1837 - - - - p. 52

No. 3.—Subscribers' Contract - - - - - - - - - p. 55

No. 4.—Subscribers' Agreement - - - - - - - - - p. 56

No. 5.—List of Subscribers - - - - - - - - - p. 59

APPENDIX.

LONDON AND BRIGHTON RAILWAY (STEPHENSON'S LINE.)

Appendix, No. 1.

PETITION of *James Sebastian Yeats.*—17 May 1837.

No. 1.
Petition of
J. Sebastian Yeats.

THE humble Petition of the undersigned James Sebastian Yeats, secretary to the Provisional Committee for forming a Railway from the South Eastern Railway to Brighton, with Branches to Lewes and Newhaven, to be called "The South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway,"

Showeth,

That in the last session of Parliament a Bill was brought into your honourable House for the making a railway from the Southampton Railway to Brighton, upon a line laid down by Messrs. George and Robert Stephenson, and that such Bill did not pass into a law.

That in pursuance of the Standing Orders of your honourable House, the promoters of the said Bill deposited, in the last session of Parliament, in the Private Bill Office, a paper purporting to be a copy of their subscription list, whereby it appeared that 921,200*l.* had been subscribed towards the said undertaking.

That the promoters of the said Bill have, in the present session, renewed their application to Parliament, and have deposited in the Private Bill Office another paper purporting to be a copy of their subscription contract and list.

That in the last-mentioned paper, the names of the shareholders, who are 249 in number, the amount subscribed by them, and the names of the persons attesting the signatures, appear in precisely the same order, and in all respects precisely correspond with those in the first-mentioned list deposited in the last session, with the exceptions hereinafter stated; viz.—

1st. Nine additional names appear on the paper deposited in the present session, which do not appear in the list of the preceding session.

2d. In the paper deposited in the last session there appear subscriptions amounting in the whole to 66,400*l.*, which have been made by James Foster, Henry D'Arbuthnot, Robert Murray, Edward Whistler, Joseph Laurence, Edward Moore, Richard L. Jones, Edward F. Starbuck and W. Scott "for" other persons; and your petitioner has reason to believe that the persons so signing had no legal authority to execute the contract on behalf of the persons whom they represent, and that they could not, in obedience to the Orders of your honourable House, bind such persons, their heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, but that such signatures are improperly added to the said list, in order to make up the aforesaid amount of 921,200*l.*

Your petitioner further alleges, that the last-mentioned unauthorized signatures have been omitted from the paper deposited during the present session in the Private Bill Office, which paper has been imposed on your honourable House as a copy of the subscription contract and list of the said company.

Your petitioner further alleges, that there appear on the said list the names of persons as subscribers for large amounts who are deeply involved in gambling transactions with shares, and who were in the habit, during last session, of executing subscription contracts in order to procure the passing of railway bills, and of afterwards refusing to register their shares when the Bills which they had by their signatures contributed to procure had passed into laws.

That the transactions of the said company, called Stephenson's Brighton Railway Company, were conducted by the directors in such a way as to encourage gambling to an extent profitable to themselves and ruinous to those whose ignorance of the method in which the price of shares is raised in the market, led them to become the victims of the acts of the said directors.

That, by some means unknown to your petitioner, the shares in this speculation were raised to a premium of 15*l.* per share in the market; and your petitioner has reason to believe that the provisional directors of the said company issued shares to the public when they were at a high premium, the purchasers of such shares paying such premium, and that such shares are now comparatively valueless, and are inflicting great loss and distress on the ignorant or unwary persons to whom they were assigned by the said directors.

That the directors and officers of the said company likewise encouraged gambling speculation in their shares, by their individual traffic therein, and have thereby caused great distress, and even ruin, to those who, trusting to the representations of the said directors and officers, purchased their shares.

No. 1.
Petition of J. Sebastian Yeats.

That Mr. William Vizard, who, together with Mr. James Leman, is the London solicitor of the said company, appears on the list of shareholders deposited this session in the Private Bill Office as a subscriber for 75 shares; but your petitioner has been informed, and believes, that the said William Vizard has long since sold his said shares at a large premium, and that such shares are now comparatively worthless.

That Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, esq., whose name appears on the said subscription list deposited in the present session as a holder of 1,390 shares, has, in a petition presented by him to your honourable House against the said undertaking, declared that he was induced by the representations of the promoters of the said Bill to subscribe, for himself, his family and his immediate friends, one-fifth of the whole capital, viz. 200,000*l.*; and that the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid is, or was, a director of the said company; and your petitioner believes that the confidence which was entertained in his wealth and discretion induced many unwary persons to involve themselves in shares of the said company; but your petitioner has been informed, and believes, that the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid has long since sold his shares, or a large portion thereof, and that he has now little or no pecuniary interest in the said undertaking.

That your petitioner has been informed, and believes, that not one-half of the persons whose names appear on the said last deposited list do in fact hold shares in the said undertaking, or did hold them when the list was deposited, in the present session, as before stated.

That there appear in the said last deposited list the names of other persons who have trafficked in the shares of the said company, and who, by selling their shares, had ceased to have any interest whatever in the said undertaking long before the depositing of the said pretended copy of the contract in the Private Bill Office in the present session; and that such persons were known by the promoters of the said Bill, at the time when the said deposit was made, to have no interest in the said undertaking.

That there further appear in the said list the names of various persons who are not worthy the credit of your honourable House for the sums subscribed by them towards the said undertaking.

Your petitioner therefore prays, that your honourable House will be pleased to cause these frauds, and these violations of the privileges of your honourable House, to be inquired into.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 2.

PETITION of Provisional Committee.—18 May 1837.

No. 2.
Petition of Provisional Committee.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Members of the Provisional Committee for forming a Railway from the Southampton Railway to Brighton, upon a line laid down by Messrs. George and Robert Stephenson,

Showeth,

That your petitioners have read the petition of James Sebastian Yeats, secretary to the provisional committee for forming a railway called "The South Eastern, Brighton and Lewes, and Newhaven Railway," presented to your honourable House on the 17th instant.

That, in the last session of Parliament, a Bill was brought into your honourable House, on behalf of your petitioners, for the making a railway from the Southampton Railway to Brighton, upon a line laid down by Messrs. George and Robert Stephenson.

That your petitioners, as the promoters of the said Bill, have in the present session renewed their application to Parliament.

That the line of railway for which your petitioners are this session seeking to obtain an Act, is in effect and in substance the same line as that for which their application to Parliament was made in the last session.

That after 52 days' investigation, last session, before a Committee of your honourable House, the Committee of your honourable House made a report very strongly in favour of Stephenson's Line, including amongst other matters a report of the usual circumstances connected with the subscription list.

That the report of your Committee was adopted, on a division, by a great majority of your honourable House, and the third reading of your petitioners' Bill was carried in your honourable House without a division.

That, after 21 days' examination before a Committee of the House of Lords, their Lordships in Committee came to the following resolution:

"That it is inexpedient to proceed in this measure in this session of Parliament."

That this resolution alone stopped the further progress of your petitioners' Bill in Parliament last session.

That during the whole progress of those inquiries the subscription lists deposited by your petitioners were in no ways impugned, or attempted to be impugned.

That it is true, as alleged in the petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats, that the shares in the said undertaking were, as your petitioners believe, after the decisions of the Committee of your honourable House, at a premium of 15*l.* per share, but such premium was caused, not by any acts of your petitioners, but by the proceedings and approbation in favour of the said line expressed by your honourable House.

That

No. 2.
Petition of Provisional Committee.

That the capital proposed to be raised, as well in the present as in the last session of Parliament, was one million.

That, in pursuance of the Standing Orders of your honourable House, the promoters of the said Bill deposited, in the last session of Parliament, in the Private Bill Office, four several papers purporting to be copies of the four several subscription contracts entered into pursuant to the Standing Orders of your honourable House, whereby it appeared that 921,200*l.* had been subscribed towards the said undertaking.

That your petitioners deposited in this session, in the said Private Bill Office, precisely the same papers, containing precisely the same names of shareholders, precisely the same number, and precisely the same amounts subscribed for, and precisely the same names of the persons attesting the signatures, and in all respects precisely corresponding with those deposited in the first-mentioned lists in the last session, with the exceptions hereinafter stated; viz.,

That the new additional names appearing on one of the said papers deposited in this session are the names of individuals who have since the last session subscribed the said deed, and become interested in the said undertaking.

That when the lists of subscribers to the different railway undertakings were printed and published by order of your honourable House, your petitioners, on examining the lists printed and published with reference to your petitioners' Bill, found that the same did not contain the list of those persons who had signed one of the said four deeds of contract by procuration, and on behalf of other persons; and your petitioners then applied (about a month or six weeks since) at the Private Bill Office of your honourable House to ascertain the cause that those names were not printed, and were informed that the original papers having been sent to Messrs. Hansard's to be printed, had been lost or mislaid, either at Messrs. Hansard's or at the Private Bill Office of your honourable House; but your petitioners are able to prove that such missing list was with the others left at the Private Bill Office of your honourable House.

That, inasmuch as the printed list of subscriptions (by the subscribers printed, by order of your honourable House, in support of this undertaking,) amounts to 866,500*l.*, and therefore is more in amount than is necessary for the passing of this Bill (pursuant to the Standing Orders) through both Houses of Parliament, your petitioners took no further steps on the subject of the said missing list, and the names not printed; but your petitioners are able to prove that James Foster, Henry D'Arbuthnot, Robert Murray, Edward W. Whistler, Joseph Laurence, Edward Moore, Richard L. Jones, Edward F. Starbuck and W. Scott, who signed for other persons, as stated in the petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats, respectively produced a written authority to execute the contract on behalf of each of the persons for whom they respectively signed, before they were permitted to sign the said contract; and such written authorities are now in the possession of the secretary to your petitioners, and are in most, if not in every instance, to the purport or effect stated in the copy hereunder written, or hereunto annexed.

That if such persons had no power to bind the heirs, executors, administrators or assigns of the persons for whom they respectively signed, still the list of signatures attached by individuals on behalf of themselves, and binding themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, is more than ample to satisfy the Orders of your honourable House; but your petitioners deny that the said signatures by procuration were improperly added to the said list, in order to make up the said amount of 921,200*l.*, for any increase of signatures beyond the sum actually signed for by principals only was not required by the Standing Orders of your honourable House.

And your petitioners deny, for the reasons above stated, that the last-mentioned list of signatures has been omitted from the paper deposited during the present session in the Private Bill Office, and they deny that this paper had been imposed on your honourable House as a copy of the subscription contract and list of the said company; and, on the contrary, your petitioners are prepared to produce the deed itself, and the authorities signed by the parties who originally applied for the shares, authorizing the signature by procuration for each individual whose name appears in the said list.

That, among the subscribers whose names appear in the list to the subscription contract of the South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway, there appear the names of "Alexander Wilson" and "Samuel Robert Healey," and which names respectively were set and subscribed by other parties, on their respective behalf, as appears by reference to the said subscription deed.

That your petitioners are unable to meet the vague and general charges and allegations contained in the petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats, and they have no means of knowing, and do not believe, that on the said list there appear the names of any persons as subscribers for large amounts who are deeply involved in gambling transactions with shares, and who were in the habit during the last session of executing subscription contracts in order to procure the passing of Railway Bills, and of afterwards refusing to register their shares when the Bills, which they had by their signatures contributed to procure, had passed into laws.

Your petitioners also deny that the transactions of the said company were conducted by the directors in such a way as to encourage gambling; and your petitioners submit that the value of the shares and the premium on the same was caused and arose from the well-known fact, that the directors of this undertaking, on a former occasion, when they had reason to be dissatisfied with the line laid down by Sir John Rennie, the engineer who was first employed by them, and when in consequence they then determined to abandon the under-

No. 2.
Petition of Provisional Committee.

taking, returned, without any deduction on any account whatever, the whole of the deposits which had been paid by the then subscribers to the then intended undertaking.

And your petitioners further submit, that the value of the shares, and the premium on them, was also in some measure caused, as your petitioners firmly believe, as well by the confidence of the public in the talents and character of the Messrs. Stephenson (the engineers to this undertaking), as by the confidence and support afforded to the same by the proceedings of your honourable House, and was also caused by the fact, that very few shares in the said undertaking were the subject of traffic or speculation in the share market, or were parted with or sold by the original subscribers to the undertaking.

That the provisional directors of the said company deny ever having issued shares to the public at a premium on any occasion, or having received any profit therefrom, beyond the deposit of 5 *l.* per share, payable by all persons to whom shares were allotted, and which in any case was paid into the hands of their bankers before the shares were issued.

That the directors and officers of the said company never encouraged gambling speculations in their shares by their individual traffic therein.

That Mr. William Vizard, who, together with Mr. James Leman, is the London solicitor of the said company, was, on the list of shareholders deposited this session in the Private Bill Office, a subscriber for 75 shares, and, in consequence of the absence of Mr. Vizard from town, your petitioners, though they know he has still a considerable number of shares in the said undertaking, are unable positively to say whether or when he sold any of his said shares, and if he has sold any, at what, if any, premium.

But they submit that Mr. Vizard, like any other individual, had a right to dispose of his shares as he pleased. And your petitioners assert, that the said William Vizard, who is amply responsible for the said sum of 7,500 *l.*, is, even though any such sale should have been effected, still responsible for the amount of his said subscription under the said deed.

That Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, esq., whose name appears in the said subscription list deposited in the present session as a holder of 1,390 shares, was a most willing and zealous supporter of the said undertaking from the commencement thereof, and was during the last session the most active of the promoters of the said Bill; and the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid was a director of the said company.

That the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid retired this year from the said direction, because the line of the said railway, and the terminus thereof, passed through the land of the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid; and his situation as one of the directors of the said company was found inconvenient and incompatible with making the necessary arrangements with him as a landowner on the line.

That your petitioners are unable to say, and have no means whatever of knowing, whether or not the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid has sold his shares, or any portion thereof; but at all events, the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, who is a man of great wealth, is liable, under the said subscription contract, for the full amount of the sums for which he has subscribed.

That your petitioners have no means of knowing whether the persons whose names appear on the said list deposited this session do or do not in fact hold shares in the said undertaking, or did hold them when the said list was deposited in the present session; but on the first allotment of the shares, your petitioners gave the subject the greatest care and consideration; and after the strictest examination and inquiry, they allowed only such persons to sign the said deed who they firmly and conscientiously believed were respectable persons, and well able to pay their calls in respect of the said shares, and that such persons who signed the said deed are still responsible for the calls on the said shares, although they may have since parted with them.

That in the first instance, and before the shares were sold at any premium, your petitioners allotted to such persons 9,000 shares; and that out of the reserve of 1,000 they have since allotted to landowners and others, who appeared to have claims on the company, other shares; but your petitioners never, as before stated, on any occasion received anything beyond the deposit of 5 *l.* per share; and your petitioners confidently assert, that the said subscription list for Stephenson's Line contains the names of some of the most wealthy and respectable men in the city of London, a fact, the correctness of which a perusal of the said list by any member of your honourable House will alone sufficiently prove.

That your petitioners, in making such deposit of their subscription lists this session, have adopted the course that was, as they are informed and believe, adopted in the Liverpool and Manchester, the Great Western, and the London and Birmingham Railway Bills, which after having failed in the first application to Parliament, afterwards, and in a subsequent session, succeeded in obtaining their respective Acts.

That your petitioners distinctly deny that there appear on the said list the names of persons who are not worthy of the credit of your honourable House, for the sums subscribed by them towards the said undertaking at the time of such subscription.

That the circumstances and facts stated in the petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats, if they were true, which your petitioners utterly deny, must have been known to the said James Sebastian Yeats (as to some) during the last session, and as to all those circumstances and facts at the commencement of the present session of Parliament.

That the said James Sebastian Yeats is the secretary, as well to the South Eastern, Lewes, Newhaven and Brighton Railway undertaking, as to the South Eastern and Dover Railway Company.

That previous to and during the progress in the last session of Parliament of the said Bill for making the said South Eastern and Dover Railway, and during the proceedings in this session on the several Brighton Bills, the directors of the said two, South Eastern and Dover,

No. 2. Petition of Provisional Committee.

Dover, South Eastern and Brighton Lines, and which are in truth and in fact one and the same set of parties, and Mr. Fearon, who is the solicitor to both companies, have repeatedly, and even so late as the 15th day of May instant, applied to your petitioners individually, and to them collectively as a body or company, to unite the said Stephenson's company with the said South Eastern and Dover Railway Company; and on its being stated to the said Mr. Fearon that such an union was impracticable, then the said Mr. Fearon proposed that some of your petitioners, as directors of Stephenson's Line, should become interested in and be members in the direction of the said South Eastern and Dover Company, in order to add, by their names and well-known wealth and respectability, "a moral influence" to the chance of the said South Eastern and Dover Company being able to make their said line; but your petitioners, on account of the magnitude of the works of the said South Eastern and Dover lines, and their belief in the insufficiency of the capital to complete those works, and the improbability of any adequate return for the outlay those works would require being ever obtained, declined to support the said undertaking; and your petitioners believe, that for this, and only this reason, the said South Eastern and Dover Railway Company have induced their secretary to present the petition hereinbefore referred to, as at the interview on the said 15th instant, which was attended by the said Mr. Fearon, a threat of the intended presentation of such petition was made previously to the application of the said Mr. Fearon to the directors of the said Stephenson's Brighton Line to take shares in and to become interested in the support of the said South Eastern and Dover Railway Company.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will be pleased to take such course with reference to the said petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats as shall appear just to your honourable House.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

(Copy.)

"London and Brighton Railway.

"I, Peter Kirk, of Carrickfergus, esq., M. P., do authorize Mr. Joseph Laurence to sign on my behalf the Parliamentary deed and shareholders' agreement for the ten 100*l.* shares I hold in this undertaking, and I request the certificates may be delivered to the above named party.

(signed) "*P. Kirk.*
"Residence, Carrickfergus.

"Mr. Richard Till, to
"The Secretary of the London and Brighton Railway."

Appendix, No. 3.

SUBSCRIBERS' CONTRACT.

No. 3. Subscribers' Contract.

This Indenture, made the 15th day of October 1835, between *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid*, of Champion-hill, Camberwell, in the county of Surrey, esq., and *William Routh*, of George-yard, Upper Thames-street, in the city of London, merchant, of the first part, *Richard Lambert Jones*, of Little Moorfields, Finsbury-square, in the city of London, house-agent, *Henry Templer*, of Green-street, Grosvenor-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., and *John Laurence*, of Russell-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., of the second part, and the several other persons whose names and seals are hereunto subscribed and affixed, of the third part, witnesseth, that the several persons parties hereto do hereby severally acknowledge and declare that they, together with the several other persons who have subscribed their names and affixed their seals to four certain other indentures, bearing even date, and of the same tenor, purport and effect with these presents, have respectively subscribed the several sums set opposite to their respective names so subscribed as aforesaid, for the purpose of constructing and establishing a railway, to be called by the name of "The London and Brighton Railway," or by such other name or names as may at any time hereafter be adopted by the provisional committee for the time being, acting on behalf of the said parties hereto and the other subscribers to the undertaking so subscribed for as herein mentioned, such railway to commence from the London and Southampton Railway at Wimbledon-common, in the county of Surrey, or from such other place in London, or not distant more than ten miles from London, as the said provisional committee for the time being shall think fit; and to terminate at Brighton, in the county of Sussex, or at such other place not distant more than ten miles from Brighton aforesaid, as the said committee for the time being shall think fit; to proceed from the commencement to the termination thereof by such course, and through such parishes, townships or places, as shall be approved of by such committee, together with such branches from the said railway to any towns or places or works lying at a distance, not exceeding ten miles from the main railway, by such routes respectively as may by the said committee be deemed expedient, and also with such works and buildings connected with

No 3. Subscribers' Contract.

such railway and branches respectively, or any of them, as may by the said committee be deemed expedient; the same railway, branches and other works, or such part or parts thereof as shall be authorized by Parliament as hereinafter mentioned, to be constructed, established and conducted in such manner as shall be directed by any Act or Acts of Parliament to be applied for and obtained in the next or any subsequent session or sessions of Parliament, either by the said committee for the time being, or, after the first of such Acts, if more than one shall have passed, by the persons thereby authorized to act on behalf of the subscribers to the said undertaking; in which Act or Acts, or the first of such Acts, if more than one, it is intended to introduce, or to endeavour to procure to be introduced, a clause constituting the subscribers to the said undertaking a corporate body, or for otherwise preventing the several subscribers to and proprietors of shares in the said undertaking, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, from being liable in any event for any larger sum than that which has been subscribed by each of them as aforesaid. And the said several persons parties hereto do hereby declare, that the said committee for the time being shall have full power and authority to select, and from time to time to vary, within the respective limits hereinbefore referred to, as well the site or spot at which the said intended railway is or shall be intended to commence as the site or spot at which the same is or shall be intended to terminate; and also to select, and from time to time to vary, the intended intermediate course thereof, and the parishes, townships or places through which such railway is or shall be intended to be carried; and also from time to time to determine what branches shall be proposed to be made therefrom; and to select, and from time to time to vary, the course of such intended branches respectively; and also to select, and from time to time to vary, the extent and situation of the several works intended to be connected with such railway and branches respectively, or any of them; and to make, and from time to time to renew, applications to Parliament for an Act or Acts authorizing the execution of such intentions and determinations, or any of them, or of all or any of the purposes aforesaid, as they in their discretion shall think proper; and, if they shall think it expedient so to do, to abstain from making any application to Parliament in the next session, and to defer such application to such period as they shall think proper, and to confine their application to Parliament, in the next or any future session or sessions, to the main line of the said railway, or to any portion of such line, either with or without all or any of the branches therefrom, and to defer the application respecting the remaining portion of such main line, or any part or parts thereof, either with or without all or any of the said branches, or respecting all or any of the said branches only, to a future session or sessions of Parliament. And this Indenture further witnesseth, that every of them, the said *Richard Lambert Jones*, *Henry Templer* and *John Laurence*, the said parties hereto of the second part, for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and to the extent only of the sum set opposite to his name hereunder written, and not further or otherwise, and also every of them the said several persons parties hereto of the third part, for himself and herself, and for his and her respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and to the extent only of the sum set opposite to his or her name hereunder written, and not further or otherwise, doth by this deed or contract covenant with the said *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid* and *William Routh*, parties hereto of the first part, their executors and administrators, and each of them the said *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid* and *William Routh*, parties hereto of the first part, for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and to the extent only of the sum set opposite to his name hereunder written, and not further or otherwise, doth by this deed or contract covenant with the said *Richard Lambert Jones*, *Henry Templer* and *John Laurence*, parties hereto of the second part, their executors and administrators, that they the said several persons parties hereto respectively, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, shall and will well and truly pay or cause to be paid the money subscribed by every of them respectively within three years from the date hereof, in such sums and to such persons, and at such places and times, as, until the passing of the said Act or Acts, shall be required by the said provisional committee, and, after the passing of the said Act or Acts, as the committee or other persons authorized by such Act or Acts shall direct or appoint. In witness whereof the said parties to these presents have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

Appendix, No. 4.

SUBSCRIBERS' AGREEMENT.

No. 4. Subscribers' Agreement.

We, the several persons who have hereunto subscribed our names, being severally subscribers to an undertaking for constructing and establishing a railway, to be called by the name of "The London and Brighton Railway," or by such other name or names as may be adopted at any time hereafter by the provisional committee hereinafter mentioned, and certain branches from the said railway, and certain works to be connected therewith, in addition to the declarations and covenants respectively made and entered into by us in regard to the said undertaking by five certain indentures of even date with these presents, do hereby, for ourselves severally and respectively, and for our several and respective heirs, executors

No. 4. Subscribers' Agreement.

executors and administrators, promise and agree, every of us, to and with the others of us, and their respective executors, administrators and assigns, that we severally and our several and respective executors, administrators and assigns, shall and will faithfully conform to and abide by the several rules and regulations hereinafter mentioned and set forth for the management and conduct of the said undertaking, until an Act or Acts of Parliament shall be obtained for that purpose; (that is to say,)

That the following persons shall be members of the provisional committee, to act on behalf of the said parties hereto and the other subscribers to the said undertaking; (that is to say), *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid*, of Champion-hill, Camberwell, in the county of Surrey, esq., *William Hichens*, of Threadneedle-street, in the city of London, stockbroker, *Richard Lambert Jones*, of Little Moorfields, Finsbury-square, in the said city of London, house-agent, *Thomas Read Kemp*, of Belgrave-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., *John Laurence*, of Russell-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., the Honourable *John Thornton Leslie Melville*, of Birchin-lane, in the said city of London, banker, *Robert Murray*, of Somerset-street, Portman-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., *Edward Horsley Palmer*, of King's Arms-yard, Coleman-street, in the said city of London, merchant, *William Routh*, of George-yard, Upper Thames-street, in the city of London, merchant, and *Henry Templer*, of Green-street, Grosvenor-square, in the said county of Middlesex, esq.; and also that any other person or persons shall be a member or members of the said provisional committee who may at any time or times hereafter be appointed by such provisional committee for the time being, out of the subscribers of the said undertaking, as a member or members of such committee, in lieu of any member or members thereof who may have died or resigned, or in addition to the existing number of members thereof; and that any member of the said provisional committee may cease to be a member thereof by sending in his resignation in writing to the secretary for the time being of the said committee.

That Messrs. *Williams, Deacon & Company*, of Birchin-lane, Cornhill, London, and Messrs. *Cocks, Biddulph & Company*, of Charing-cross, in the city and liberty of Westminster, in the county of Middlesex, shall, for the present, be the London bankers of the said undertaking; and Messrs. *Wigney & Company* shall, for the present, be the Brighton bankers of the said undertaking.

That Messrs. *Vizard & Leman*, of Lincoln's Inn Fields, in the county of Middlesex, shall, for the present, be the London solicitors of the said undertaking; and Messrs. *Attree, Clarke & M'Whinnie*, of Brighton, shall, for the present, be the Brighton solicitors of the said undertaking.

That Mr. *George Parker Bidder* shall, for the present, be the acting engineer, and Messrs. *G. & R. Stephenson* shall, for the present, be the consulting engineers of the said undertaking.

That the members for the time being of the said provisional committee, or some of them, shall meet from time to time for promoting the said undertaking, but that no business shall be transacted at any such meeting unless three members at least of the said committee shall be present thereat.

That the majority of members attending any meeting of the said committee, consisting of not less than three members, shall bind all the members thereof, whether present or absent; and the member in the chair at any such meeting shall, in all cases in which the votes shall happen to be equal, have a double or casting vote; and all acts which shall be decided on by a majority of votes at any such meeting shall, for the purposes of these presents, and of the said indentures of even date herewith, be considered as acts of the whole of the said committee.

That minutes of all the proceedings of every meeting of the said committee shall be entered in a book to be kept for that purpose, and shall be signed by the member in the chair at such meeting.

That the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power from time to time to appoint the sub-committees in Brighton, or elsewhere, delegating to such sub-committee such duties and powers as such provisional committee may think proper.

That the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power to carry the said undertaking into effect, and for that purpose to cause the requisite surveys to be made, to obtain estimates, to make arrangements, bargains and contracts with railway, canal and harbour proprietors, land-owners and any others with whom the said committee may find it expedient to make any arrangement, bargain or contract, and generally to adopt all measures which such committee, or any sub-committee appointed by them, may consider as necessary or expedient for obtaining an Act or Acts of Parliament for the establishment of the said undertaking or any part thereof, or for furthering or facilitating the progress of such Act or Acts through the Houses of Parliament, or either of them, in the success of the said undertaking.

That the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power to take offices for the business of the said undertaking, to appoint, suspend or remove the bankers, solicitors, engineers, surveyors, secretaries, clerks, agents, servants and workmen for to be employed in the said undertaking, and to pay and allow all such rent, salaries and recompence as the said provisional committee shall think right, and to enter into contracts and

No. 4
Subscribers' Agreement.

agreements for the said undertaking or any part thereof, and for the completion of the proposed surveys, and all other matters incident to obtaining the proposed Act or Acts of Parliament; and also to apply all or any part of the monies paid or to be paid by way of deposit, as hereinafter mentioned, in payment of all such rent, salaries, recompences and engagements as aforesaid, and of the expenses of applying for, soliciting and obtaining an Act or Acts of Parliament, as hereinbefore and in the said indentures of even date herewith is mentioned, and all other costs, charges and expenses incurred or to be incurred relative or incident to or for the benefit or advancement of the said undertaking, or which they have been or may be put to in respect or on account thereof, or relating thereto, whether such costs, charges and expenses have reference to the acts of the before-mentioned committee or any other committee or any member of the same respectively, and whether with reference to the present proposed or any other line or lines of railway from London to Brighton.

That the said provisional committee shall have full power from time to time to make and establish all such bye-laws and rules as they may think necessary or expedient for the good government of themselves and the said sub-committees.

That the monies already subscribed by the several subscribers to the said undertaking, and to be subscribed by any new subscribers thereto (all which monies are together to form a capital of 1,000,000*l.* sterling) shall be divided into shares of 100*l.* each, and shall be and be considered a fund applicable to the performance and fulfilment of all and every or any arrangement or arrangements, bargains, contracts or agreements entered into by the said provisional committee under the powers of or pursuant to this agreement, and generally for the carrying into effect the purposes of the said Act or Acts of Parliament.

That the said provisional committee will not recognise the transfer of any share or shares in the said undertaking until an Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the said undertaking or some part thereof shall have been obtained.

That the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power to raise such portion (if any) of the said capital of 1,000,000*l.* sterling as has already been subscribed for, or the deposit whereon may not be paid as hereinafter mentioned, or any part thereof, by allowing such persons as they shall think fit to become subscribers to and take shares in the said undertaking

That a deposit of 5*l.* per share shall be immediately paid by every of the said parties hereto (if any) who has not already paid such deposit, and that a like deposit shall be paid by every person who may hereafter become a subscriber to the said undertaking, at the time of his so subscribing; but that no further deposit or sum shall be called for on account of expenses or otherwise until an Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the said undertaking or some part thereof shall have been obtained.

That it shall be distinctly provided in such Act or Acts of Parliament that no call shall be made upon the subscribers to the said undertaking, or any of them, which shall exceed the sum of 10*l.* per share at any one call; and that there shall always be an interval of two months between every two calls.

That the said committee shall be empowered, if they shall see fit, to invest such deposits in the purchase of any of the Government or other public funds, or of Exchequer bills.

That the committee shall be accountable for all income and profit which may arise from any such purchase, but shall not be answerable for any loss, if any such shall be occasioned thereby.

That, except as herein or in the said indentures of even date herewith is otherwise provided, the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power to cause or procure, or endeavour to cause or procure, to be inserted in such Act or Acts as aforesaid, all such clauses and provisions as they shall deem necessary or expedient for carrying into effect all or any of the arrangements, bargains, contracts or agreements that may be entered into by them under the powers of or pursuant to this agreement, as well as for enforcing payment of the monies so subscribed or to be subscribed as aforesaid; and for providing engines, carriages and machinery to be used on the said railroad, branches and works, and generally for managing the affairs of the said undertaking, or as they shall otherwise deem to be for the benefit of the said undertaking or of the subscribers thereto.

That in the event of the said application or applications to Parliament, in the next or any subsequent session or sessions thereof, being unsuccessful, all costs and expenses of every description already incurred or hereafter to be incurred, attending such application or applications and the said proposed undertaking or any part thereof, shall be paid and borne by the subscribers to the said undertaking rateably out of the deposit paid or to be paid by each person upon his or her shares. As witness their hands and seals, the 15th day of October 1835.

Appendix No. 5.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.	Seals.	RESIDENCE.	Quality or Calling of the Subscribers.	Sums Subscribed.	Witnesses' Names.
				£.	
Isaac L. Goldsmid	(L. S.)	Champion-hill, Camberwell, Surrey	esquire	120,000	
J. T. L. Melville	—	Birchin-lane and Roehampton	honourable	15,000	
Henry Templar	—	31, Green-street, Grosvenor-sq., & 1, Castle-court, Birchin-lane.	esquire	21,000	
William Routh	—	George-yard, Upper Thames-street, and of Blackheath, Kent.	merchant	21,000	
Richard L. Jones	—	Little Moor-fields, and Highbury Park, Middlesex.	estate agent	11,000	
Robert Murray	—	35, Somerset-street, Portman-square	esquire	21,000	
John Laurence	—	Russell-square	ditto	10,000	
Joseph Laurence	—	Auction Mart, and Blackheath	gentleman	10,000	
Alexander Henry	—	Birchin-lane, and Winchester-place, Pentonville.	merchant	1,000	
William Hichens	—	18, Threadneedle-street, and Camberwell Grove.	broker	15,000	
William Vizard	—	16, New-street, Spring Gardens	gentleman	7,500	
L. M. Simon	—	10, Warnford-court, and 10, Paragon, Blackheath.	ditto	5,500	
L. Richardson	—	Stock Exchange, & St. Jermayne's-place, Blackheath.	gentleman	1,000	
Robert Hichens	—	18, Threadneedle-street, and Grove, East Dulwich.	broker	15,000	
Frederick Harrison	—	18, Threadneedle-street, and Muswell-hill.	ditto	5,000	
Thomas Manning	—	22, New Ormond-street, and Stock Exchange.	gentleman	500	
Adam Gordon	—	6, Old London-street, and Blackheath Park.	ditto	6,000	
Edward F. Starbuck	—	6, Old London-st., & 14 America-square.	merchant	2,300	
John Barton	—	Hampstead	gentleman	500	
J. W. Humphry	—	37, Old Jewry	ditto	1,000	
Charles T. Pearce	—	Auction Mart, and Peckham Rye, Surrey.	gentleman	5,000	John Underhay.
Jos. Wilson	—	Highbury Hill	esquire	4,500	
Frederick Secretan	—	Alliance Office, Bartholomew-lane, & Oxford-terrace, Edgeware-rd.	gentleman	2,000	
Andrew Smith	—	1, Birchin-lane, and 25, Penton-st.	broker	1,500	
John M. Pearce	—	Swithin's-lane, and Hampstead	solicitor	2,000	
John Whitmore	—	Auction Mart, & Clapham-common	gentleman	7,000	
Robert Prance	—	Stock Exchange, and Hampstead	ditto	2,500	
E. Eyton	—	Hornsey	broker	1,000	
Joseph Laurence	—	Auction Mart, and Blackheath	gentleman	7,000	
Joseph Pease	—	Feethams, Darlington	ditto	20,000	
Thomas Murdock	—	6, New Broad-street, and 8, Portland-place.	merchant	2,000	
Benjamin Laurence	—	5, Crown-court, Broad-street, and Hornsey.	ditto	2,000	
Charles Otway Mayne	—	19, Hanover-terrace, Regent's Park	gentleman	2,000	
William Rawlins	—	13, Liverpool-street	knight	500	
William Thompson	—	Upper Thames-street	merchant	3,000	
William Scott	—	Grove, Camberwell, and Stock Exchange.	gentleman	2,000	
Robert Moser	—	Upper Thames-street	merchant	4,000	
John Cattley	—	Queenhithe, and Highbury	ditto	5,000	
L. S. Baxendale	—	7, Great Winchester-street, and 36, Tavistock-square.	solicitor	2,000	
W. E. Ferrers	—	Croydon	merchant	2,000	
Stephen Cannon	—	Stock Exchange, and Woodbank, Gerrard's-cross.	gentleman	3,000	
James Hutchinson	—	Highbury Park	ditto	2,000	
A. F. Slade	—	Battersea, Surrey	ditto	1,000	
David Allan	—	Compton-terrace, Islington	merchant	500	
Joshua Hutchinson	—	Highbury Park, ditto	gentleman	1,000	
James Foster	—	Stamford-hill, Middlesex	ditto	4,000	

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.	Seals.	RESIDENCE.	Quality or Calling of the Subscribers.	Sums Subscribed.	Witnesses' Names.
				£.	
J. Horsley Palmer	(L. S.)	King's Arms Yard	merchant	5,000	
George Crawshay	—	Upper Thames-street, & Montague-street, Russell square.	ditto	5,000	
William M. Millers	—	Grange-road, Bermondsey	gentleman	1,000	
Charles Webb	—	Balham, Surrey	ditto	500	
Alexander Doorman	—	8, Euston-square	merchant	1,500	
Edward Moser	—	17, King-street	ditto	500	
D. Banks	—	Sheerness	gentleman	1,000	
William Collins	—	2, Broad-street-buildings	merchant	1,000	
Robert Davies	—	Lloyd's, and Wandsworth-common	ditto	2,500	
Thomas Hathway	—	Cornhill, and Camberwell	newspaper agent	500	
J. H. Bradshaw	—	Hornsey, and 62, Lombard-street	banker	2,000	
John Meadows White	—	1, Frederick-place, Old Jewry, and 1, Paragon, Blackheath.	attorney	1,000	
George Laurence	—	6, Bury-court, St. Mary Axe, and Stamford-hill.	merchant	1,500	
George Pearce	—	2, Bank Chambers, Lothbury	insurance broker	2,000	John Underhay.
Edward Clark	—	5, Jeffery-square, and 39, Mincing-lane.	merchant	500	
John Lewis Rutley	—	Coldbath-row, Greenwich	gentleman	500	
William Bourne	—	Great Dover-street, Borough	ditto	500	
J. C. Lowell	—	13, Paragon, Blackheath, & 6, George-lane, City.	merchant	1,000	
Henry Carter	—	66, Lombard-street	gentleman	10,000	
William Crawshay	—	George-yard, Upper Thames-street, and Merthyr Tidvil.	iron-master	5,000	
Teynham	—	Carnegie-house, Kensington	gentleman	1,000	
F. Baildon	—	34, Highbury-place	ditto	1,000	
Henry Wheeler	—	Cannonbury-grove	ditto	1,000	
George Probyn	—	21, Bryanstone-square	esquire	5,000	
John Wray	—	6, Suffolk-place	barrister	1,000	
Richard E. Townshend	—	Springfield, Norwood	gentleman	4,000	
Charles Sutherland	—	Park-road, Blackheath	broker	2,000	
John Lock	—	Herne-hill, Surrey	gentleman	2,500	
John Pirie	—	Freeman's-court	merchant	2,000	Richard Till.
James Walkinshaw	—	10, Hanover-terrace, Regent's Park	ditto	2,000	
John Moser	—	17, King-street, Cheapside	broker	500	
Thomas Carter	—	32, Gordon-street, Gordon-square	gentleman	1,500	
John Scott	—	2, Alderman's-walk, and Upper Clapton.	merchant	2,000	
Charles M'Garel	—	14, Wimpole-street	ditto	4,000	
John Gunston	—	27, Upper Thames-street	ditto	7,000	
Wm. Haseldine Pepys	—	11, Earl's-terrace, Kensington	surgeons' instrument maker.	500	
James G. Gordon	—	19, Upper Gower-street	merchant	500	
J. Deacon	—	Birchin-lane, and Mabledon Park, Tonbridge.	banker	15,000	
Charles E. Mangles	—	Flexford House, Guildford	merchant	2,000	
William W. Hichens	—	Threadneedle-street, and Camberwell-grove.	broker	3,200	
John Laurence	—	Russell-square	esquire	3,200	
S. N. Barber	—	Denmark-hill, Camberwell	broker	5,000	
P. Cazenove	—	Upper Clapton, Middlesex	stockbroker	2,000	
R. Small	—	York-terrace, Regent's Park	merchant	2,000	John Underhay.
Joseph Laurence	—	Blackheath	gentleman	3,200	
W. Goldsmid	—	36, Bloomsbury-square	ditto	1,000	
George Webb	—	14, Surrey-square	stockbroker	1,500	
J. Solly, jun.	—	Chesnut-walk, Layton	merchant	2,500	
George Bayley	—	2, China-terrace, Kennington-road	gentleman	3,000	
William Borrodaile	—	Streatham, Surrey	ditto	1,500	
William Routh	—	George-yard, Upper Thames-street	merchant	1,200	
Arthur Savage	—	168, Fleet-street	gentleman	1,500	
W. A. Thomas	—	Highbury-grove, Middlesex, and 50, Threadneedle-street.	ditto	2,500	
Charles Hensley	—	Upper Clapton, Middlesex	ditto	2,000	
Frederick Roberts	—	North House, Regent's Park	ditto	3,500	
Edward Harrison	—	Berkeley-street, Berkeley-square	ditto	2,000	
Thomas Harrington	—	Brighton	esquire	12,000	
Joseph Tulley	—	Green's Hotel, Lincoln's inn-fields	merchant	9,000	
James Cousens	—	8, Paragon, Blackheath	wholesale tea-dealer.	1,500	
Robert Currey	—	Herne-hill, Dulwich	merchant	500	Richard Till.
Isaac L. Goldsmid	—	Dulwich-hill House	esquire	19,000	John Underhay.
T. Allen Shuter	—	Shad Thames, Southwark	merchant	2,000	Richard Till.
Archibald Hastie	—	3, West-street, Finsbury	ditto	2,000	

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.	Seals.	RESIDENCE.	Quality or Calling of the Subscribers.	Sums Subscribed.	Witnesses' Names.
				£.	
Leonard Redmayne	(L. S.)	176, Oxford-street	upholsterer	11,000	Henry Leman.
G. Hayward	—	172, Western-road, Brighton	gentleman	500	James Leman.
Edward Tyrrell	—	Ewell, Surrey	esquire	1,000	
Matthias Attwood	—	Gracechurch-street	banker	4,000	
J. T. L. Melville	—	Roehampton	ditto	1,700	
David Mocatta	—	22, Great Coram-street	architect	2,500	Richard Till.
Charles Harrison	—	34, Connaught-square	gentleman	2,000	
William Day	—	Isleworth	surgeon	1,000	
John Cass Birkinshaw	—	24, Alpha-road	engineer	500	
Richard Crawshay	—	Woningham Hall	iron-merchant	5,000	James Leman.
Joshua Walker	—	19, Grove-end-road	merchant	3,000	
Lagos	—	11, Park-crescent	Baron Lagos	10,000	John Underhay.
Charles Colwill	—	181, Western road, Brighton	linendraper	200	
William Reed	—	Ivy Cottage, Lambeth, Surrey	gentleman	2,000	
William Venables	—	Hill House, Tooting, ditto	merchant	2,500	Richard Till.
John Ashton Yates	—	12, Great Cumberland-place	gentleman	1,000	John Underhay.
Francis H. Goldsmid	—	Champion-hill	barrister	6,000	
John Barclay	—	Hornsey-lane	gentleman	3,000	
James Block	—	Finchley	ditto	3,000	
Thomas Lodder	—	Southampton-buildings, Holborn	law stationer	1,000	
Thomas Fowler	—	Broad-street	banker	2,000	
M. A. Goldsmid	—	Gloucester-place, Portman-square	off. assignee	3,000	
T. Somers Cocks	—	Charing-cross	banker	2,500	
William Bruce	—	8, George-yard, Lombard-street	merchant	15,000	
John T. Selwood	—	Bridport, Dorset	gentleman	15,000	
Henry Templer	—	31, Green-street, Grosvenor-square	merchant	3,200	
James Austin	—	18, Acton-place, Kingsland-road	gentleman	5,000	
John Rae Reid	—	Pall-mall	baronet	1,000	
William Duff	—	Red Lion-square	gentleman	5,000	
R. F. Newman	—	Guildhall	ditto	500	
James Harby	—	Poplar	merchant	1,000	
Edward Howley Palmer	—	8, Old Burlington-street	ditto	8,200	Richard Till.
Joseph Hardcastle	—	35, Abchurch-lane	ditto	2,000	
Alfred Hardcastle	—	ditto	ditto	2,000	
Joshua Scholefield	—	Birmingham	gentleman	8,000	
Charles Barker	—	Birchin-lane	ditto	500	
John Scott	—	10, New Broad-street	surgeon	2,000	
Frederick Pattison	—	29, Welbeck-street	gentleman	1,000	
M. Wolverly Attwood	—	27, Gracechurch-street	ditto	4,000	
John Alleard	—	65, Lombard street	ditto	1,000	
Ferdinand Slade	—	Battersea, Surrey	ditto	1,000	
Jeffery Cullen	—	5, Marlbro'-place, Old Kent-road	ditto	1,000	
Richard Fell	—	Uxbridge	mealman	1,000	
Samuel Gurney	—	Lombard-street	broker	5,000	
W. Stephens	—	80, Bishopsgate-street within	wine-merchant	1,000	
Cristobal de Murrieta	—	30, Tavistock-square	merchant	1,000	
Thomas Laurence	—	Lee-grove, Blackheath	gentleman	500	
Robert Walters	—	30, Lincoln's-inn-fields	barrister	1,000	John Underhay.
Edward Halse	—	34, Jewin-street	merchant	500	Jos. A. Lewis.
William Marshall	—	41, Upper Grosvenor-street	esquire	10,500	
Elias Mocatta, jun.	—	38, Chester-terrace	esquire	2,500	
Henry Aug. Templer	—	Bridport, Dorset	gentleman	10,000	
John Gandell	—	1, Mecklenburgh-street	merchant	2,000	Richard Till.
Samuel Hilbert Ellis	—	Keppel-street, Russell-square	gentleman	1,000	
Fermin de Tastet	—	Alderman's-walk	merchant	2,000	
William Tooke	—	12, Russell-square	solicitor	1,000	Jos. A. Lewis.
T. Bish	—	Cornhill	stockbroker	1,000	Richard Till.
Rob. Fred. Gower	—	28, Coleman-street	merchant	2,000	
J. Clayton Freeling	—	38, York-place	esquire	1,000	Jos. A. Lewis.
Anna Maria Goldsmid	—	Champion-hill	-	1,000	
Z. Laurence	—	37, Russell-square	merchant	2,000	
William Richardson	—	1, Wallbrook	solicitor	500	
S. A. Vardon	—	Oxford-terrace	gentleman	3,000	
John Louis Lemmé	—	1, Finsbury-terrace	merchant	2,000	
C. P. Marié de Buck	—	9, Kingsland-road	ditto	3,000	
Charles Few	—	Covent-garden	gentleman	5,000	Richard Till.
Thomas Hamilton	—	Henrietta-street, Covent-garden	ditto	2,500	
Robert Watkins	—	Arundel, Sussex	ditto	2,500	
William Reed	—	South Lambeth	ditto	2,500	
Edward Blount	—	Bryanstone-square	ditto	2,500	Jos. A. Lewis.
Richard Rayley	—	Lincoln's-inn	esquire	1,000	
Richard L. Jones	—	Highbury-park	ditto	1,200	Richard Till.
William Griffin	—	22, Cornhill	jeweller	100	
Thomas Wm. Clagett	—	Fetcham	gentleman	2,500	
Robert Moser	—	Upper Thames-street	iron-merchant	2,000	Jos. A. Lewis.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.	Seals.	RESIDENCE.	Quality or Calling of the Subscribers.	Sums Subscribed.	Witnesses' Names.
				£.	
Peter Kensett - -	(L. S.)	Billingshurst - - - -	grocer - -	300	
James W. Freshfield, jr.	—	New Bank-buildings - - -	- - -	2,500	Richard Till.
William Stanley Clarke	—	Elm-bank, Leatherhead - -	esquire - -	4,000	
William Crawshay -	—	Cyfarthfa, Cardiff - - -	iron-master -	5,000	J. Leman.
James Andrew - -	—	Ewell, Surrey - - - -	gentleman -	500	J. H. Wright.
George Talbot - -	—	Hanover-square - - - -	baronet - -	1,000	
Richard L. Jones -	—	Little Moor-fields - - -	surveyor - -	5,000	Richard Till.
Frederick Swanwick -	—	Bank of Manchester, Manchester -	civil engineer -	1,000	
Denzil Onslow - -	—	Staughton House, Hunts - -	general in the army	100	
J. Hinxman - -	—	Great Russell-street, Bloomsbury-square.	gentleman -	1,500	Jos. A. Lewis.
W. Chadwick - -	—	Southwark - - - - -	surveyor - -	1,000	
F. Read - - -	—	His Majesty's Customs - - -	gentleman -	500	Richard Till
Robert Upperton -	—	8, Lansdowne-place, Hove - -	solicitor - -	500	
Thomas Gotobed -	—	82, Great Russell-square, Bloomsbury, London.	gentleman -	500	
Richard Newnham -	—	Steyne-lane, Brighton - - -	surgeon - -	1,500	
Thomas Thorby -	—	35, North-street, ditto - - -	chemist - -	300	
Samuel Ridley - -	—	138, North-street, ditto - -	auctioneer -	700	
Richard Stuckey -	—	Albion Hotel, ditto - - -	innkeeper -	500	
William Lambert -	—	62, Western-road, ditto - -	stonemason . -	500	
Anthony Lamprel -	—	East-street, ditto - - - -	bath proprietor	200	
Edmund Savage -	—	Pavilion Hotel, ditto - - -	tavern-keeper -	300	
John Yeates - -	—	18, York-place, ditto - - -	brewer - -	2,500	
Jacob Boys - -	—	60, Grand-parade, ditto - -	solicitor - -	300	
John Lashmar - -	—	20, Middle-street, ditto - -	merchant - -	1,000	
Isaac Bass - -	—	Black Lion-street, ditto - -	ditto - -	2,000	
George Parsons -	—	York Hotel, ditto - - -	hotel-keeper -	500	
John Labouchere -	—	Birchin-lane, and 6, Upper Harley-street.	banker - -	15,000	
Charles Price - -	—	3, Old Steyne, Brighton - -	physician - -	1,500	
James Henry Mills -	—	High-street, ditto - - -	broker - -	300	
Jos. Parsons - -	—	Marine-parade, ditto - - -	auctioneer -	500	
Edward Butler - -	—	Gloucester-place, ditto - - -	collector of rates	200	
L. E. Cohen - -	—	Clarence-place, ditto - - -	printer - -	200	
John Hilton - -	—	Church-street, ditto - - -	grocer - -	500	
John Good - -	—	East-street, ditto - - - -	hairdresser -	200	
J. N. Wigney - -	—	Brunswick-square, ditto - -	banker - -	2,500	John Underhay.
J. Cordy - - -	—	117, London-road, ditto - -	wine-merchant -	500	
Emma Wright - -	—	Ditchling-road, ditto - - -	spinster - -	500	
Charles Bellingham -	—	9, Marine-parade, ditto - -	attorney - -	700	
Cordelia Walker -	—	Royal York Hotel, ditto - -	- - -	100	
John Bradshaw - -	—	79, Western-road, ditto - -	tailor - -	500	
John Mills - -	—	St. George's-place, ditto - -	esquire - -	2,500	
Robert Taylor - -	—	28, Old Steyne, ditto - - -	surgeon - -	1,000	
Richard Inman - -	—	40, St. James's-street, ditto - -	grocer - -	500	
Thomas Attree - -	—	Ship-street, ditto - - - -	solicitor - -	2,500	
Thomas Atkins Inman	—	Black Lion-street, ditto - -	merchant - -	500	
Harriet Swinley -	—	Marine-parade, ditto - - -	spinster - -	500	
J. H. Borrer - -	—	Gloucester-place, ditto - -	banker - -	500	
William Attree - -	—	West-hill Lodge, ditto - - -	surgeon, &c. to the King.	500	
William Furner -	—	1, Pavilion-parade, ditto - -	solicitor - -	500	
Edward Morling -	—	22, Albion-street, ditto - -	brewer - -	100	
John Allfree - -	—	11, Gloster-place, ditto - -	schoolmaster -	100	
F. R. Bonham - -	—	25, Dover-street, London - -	esquire - -	1,000	
Benjamin Wood -	—	41, Clarence-place - - -	plumber - -	500	
Edward Dubbins -	—	Regent Cottage, Brighton - -	brewer - -	100	
Edward Everard -	—	The Wick, Hove - - - -	D. D. - -	100	
Henry Cooper - -	—	Adelaide-crescent, Hove - -	gentleman -	200	
William Acton - -	—	21, Brighton-place, Brighton -	butcher - -	300	
Samuel Thompson -	—	14, Clapham Rise, Surrey - -	gentleman -	1,000	J. S. M'Whinnie.
George Harrington -	—	Old Steyne, Brighton - - -	ditto - -	2,500	Somers Clarke.
John Strachan - -	—	Old Ship Hotel, ditto - - -	hotel-keeper -	100	
John Allfree - -	—	Gloucester-place, ditto - -	schoolmaster -	200	J. S. M'Whinnie.
E. G. Cuff - -	—	Old Ship Hotel, ditto - - -	hotel-keeper -	100	Somers Clarke.
Thomas Harrington -	—	Old Steyne, ditto - - -	gentleman -	3,500	Frank A. Argles.
Hen. Fred. Stephenson	—	5, Arlington-street - - -	esquire - -	2,500	Richard Till.
T. Allen Shuter -	—	Southwark - - - - -	merchant - -	500	
			TOTAL - - - £.	861,400	

SEVENTH REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

RAILWAY SUBSCRIPTION LISTS;

TOGETHER WITH THE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

Brighton Railway (Stephenson's Line.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
17 *July* 1837.

Mercurii, 22° die Februarii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the matters of several Petitions, complaining of the Names of certain needy and indigent Persons having been inserted in the Subscription Lists of several Railways, and praying for Inquiry into the Case of the Deptford and Dover Railway Subscription List; and to whom several Petitions containing similar allegations were particularly referred.

Martis, 1° die Martii, 1837.

A Committee was nominated of,—

Mr. Warburton.
Mr. Dugdale.
Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Aaron Chapman.
Mr. Charles Lushington.
Sir Eardley Wilmot.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. John Young.
Mr. Daniel Gaskell.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. George Evans.

Ordered, THAT the said Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers and Records.

Ordered, THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Mercurii, 19° die Aprilis, 1837.

Order [1st March] that Five be the Quorum of the Committee, read, and discharged.

Ordered, THAT Three be the Quorum of the said Committee.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to report their Opinion, together with the Minutes of the Evidence taken before them, from time to time, to The House.

Veneris, 21° die Aprilis, 1837.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Dugdale, Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. John Young and Mr. George Evans be discharged from further attendance; and that Mr. Chalmers be added to the Committee.

THE REPORT - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - p. 1
APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - p. 51

SEVENTH REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE to whom have been referred sundry Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contracts of certain Railway Companies, and, among these, the following Petitions respecting the Parliamentary Subscription Contract of the Company for forming a Line of Railway from London to Brighton, commonly called Stephenson's Line; viz.

1st. That of James Sebastian Yeats, Secretary of the Provisional Committee of the South-Eastern Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company, objecting to the Subscription Contract of the said Company for forming a Line of Railway, called Stephenson's Line, on grounds therein stated:

2dly. That of certain Members of the Provisional Committee for forming a Line of Railway, called Stephenson's Line, in answer to the Allegations contained in the first above-mentioned Petition:

And who were empowered to report their Observations, together with the MINUTES OF EVIDENCE taken before them, from time to time, to The House;——HAVE taken Evidence on the Matters adverted to in the said Petitions, or having reference thereto, and have heard the observations made on such Evidence by the Counsel for the above petitioning Parties, and, after considering the whole of the Premises, have agreed to the following REPORT:

THE project for the formation of a Company to obtain an Act for making a Line of Railway commonly called Stephenson's Line, to commence upon the Line of the Southampton Railway, and to pass through Shoreham to Brighton, was set on foot at the close of the summer of 1835. According to the first prospectus issued by the promoters of this project, the capital required for the Undertaking was estimated at 1,000,000*l.*, to be raised in 10,000 shares of 100*l.* each, the deposit per share to be 5*l.* The allotment of shares was made by a provisional committee. The allottees were required to pay their deposits to the Company's bankers, and on their producing the bankers' receipt, and signing the Parliamentary Contract and Subscribers' Agreement, certificates were delivered to them. None but allottees were permitted to sign the Deed; where parties proposed to sign by procuration for original allottees, a written authority was required; and for signatures of this kind, by the advice of the solicitor, a separate copy of the Deed was reserved. The subscribers to the Deed, looking to the position of each at the time, are stated to have been, without exception, persons of very high respectability. The number of shares allotted previous to the close of the Session of 1836 is stated to have been 9,000, of which 2,924 were allotted to members of the provisional committee. A new allotment was made of 407 of the reserved shares in November 1836, making the total number of allotted shares 9,407, and the number of reserved shares 593. As to 147 of

21562. 21867. 21580. 22575. 21590. 21660. 21875. 21876 to 21880. 21693. 21885, 21886. 21619. 21636. 21632. 21[illegible]7.

the allotted shares, the deposits have been paid, but the Deed has not been
21672. signed. As to 27 of the allotted shares, neither have the deposits been paid nor has the deed been signed; that is to say, the Deed has been signed for 9,233 shares, inclusive of those which have been signed for by procuration, and the deposits have been paid on 9,380 shares. The varied fortunes of the Bill of this Company during the Session of 1836, its success in the Commons' House, and its defeat in the House of Lords, are too generally known to need to be
22506. related. On the Bill passing the House of Commons, the shares rose to 17 or
22516. 18 premium, which was higher than the premium at which the shares of any Company were selling which had not obtained its Act of Parliament. On the
21631. throwing out of the Bill in the House of Lords, the shares fell to 1*l.* discount. The deposit money paid on 9,380 shares would amount to 46,900*l.* The balance remaining in the hands of the Company, after deducting the expenses and
21864. liabilities attendant on the first application to Parliament, is stated to be 9,000*l.*, which would show that the cost attendant on the first application to Parliament was 37,900*l.* With a restrictive clause in their Subscribers' Agreement to the
21747. following effect, that "no further deposit (beyond that of 5*l.* per share already paid) should be called for on account of expenses or otherwise, until the Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the said Undertaking, or some part thereof, should have been obtained," and with an unexpended balance remaining out of that deposit of only 9,000*l.*, the provisional committee had to take their measures for meeting the Session of Parliament of 1837. A general
21708. 21715. meeting was called in August 1836, by a letter addressed to each original sub-
21719. scriber, at which it was stated by the chairman, Mr. Routh, without laying before the persons assembled the accounts of the Company, that the assets would be
21721. sufficient to warrant a second application to Parliament, without making any further call; and instructions were given to the Directors by this meeting to go on with their application in the coming Session. A circular was addressed, on the 14th of November, to the subscribers at large, enclosing a report from the engineer of the Company, Mr. Stephenson, and informing them that certain gentlemen, whose names were given in the circular, had been added to the provisional committee. Among these were certain individuals who did not belong
21576. to the original allottees, but who had acquired an interest in the concerns of the
21801, 21802. 21837. Company by purchasing the shares of allottees. Among these were also the name of an individual, Mr. Sheriff Johnston, who, though an original allottee
21638. 21672. for 25 shares, had neither signed the Deed nor paid his deposit, but is stated to
21853, 21854. have become a holder of other shares by purchase. The plans, which were
21578. deposited in the Private Bill Office on the 30th of November, did not differ in any very essential particulars from those deposited the previous year. The course adopted in respect of the Subscription List was to lodge in the Private Bill Office a copy of the List of Subscribers whose names were attached to the
21704, 21705. Subscription Contract of the former Session, with the addition only of the names of seven persons who had become subscribers and signed the Deed since that Session. The List deposited contains subscriptions, exclusive of those of the parties who signed by procuration, to the amount of 861,400*l.*; the subscriptions
21633. 21696. 21876. of the parties who signed by procuration, though not, it should appear, by letter of attorney, amounted to 66,900*l.* The latter, by some neglect either of the printer or of the clerks of the Private Bill Office, have been omitted from the
22684, *et seq.* Subscription List of this Company, printed by order of The House in the course of the present Session.

The instances in which the Subscription List, of the present Session, of this Company, has been objected to, on grounds similar to those which have been

taken

taken in the cases of the other Subscription Lists which Your Committee has been appointed to examine, such as that the parties are of insufficient pecuniary responsibility and the like, are so few in point of number, and so unimportant in point of amount, that Your Committee does not consider it necessary to notice them. An objection, however, of a general nature has been raised against the Subscription List as a whole, on the ground that it is not a list of new subscriptions, made by parties in support of the Bill of the present Session, but a mere copy of the Subscription List of the last Session; that the subscribers to that former List have already paid their deposit of 5*l.* on their several shares; that by far the greater part of the fund created by those payments has been exhausted in the expenses incurred in the application to Parliament during the last session; that by the restrictive clause contained in the Subscribers' Agreement, and already cited, the provisional committee being prevented, until they obtain an Act of Parliament, from making any further call, the said committee, should they fail in obtaining an Act, would be unprovided with the means of paying the cost of their then renewed application; that a large proportion of the persons whose names appear as subscribers on the List of the last Session, and who, at the commencement of that Session, were as well the holders of the shares set against their names as subscribers for them, have since that period alienated their shares, and did not, in fact, hold any interest in the Undertaking at the time that the List was lodged in the Private Bill Office, at the beginning of the present Session; that many of the members of the provisional committee have been largely concerned in trafficking in shares, and that such traffic is in violation of a clause in the Subscribers' Agreement of the said Company, which expressly declares "that the said provisional committee will not recognise the transfer of any share or shares in the said Undertaking, until an Act or Acts for authorizing or establishing the said Undertaking, or some part thereof, shall have been obtained." It appears to Your Committee, that the course taken by the provisional committee of this Company, in depositing anew a copy of the contract entered into by the subscribers at the commencement of the previous Session, was a course consistent with the provisions of their Parliamentary Contract and Subscribers' Agreement, authorizing them to make application to Parliament, as well in the then ensuing as in any subsequent Session, and was the only course which it was open to the provisional committee to take, consistently with the last cited clause in the Subscribers' Agreement, whereby it is declared that the transfer of shares before the obtaining of an Act of Parliament shall not be recognised. And had it not been for the restriction clause also above cited, prohibiting the said provisional committee, until after obtaining an Act of Parliament, from calling for any new deposit, it appears to Your Committee that the course pursued, in presenting anew the original Subscription List, was far less likely to lead to the abuse of depositing a list of persons of insufficient responsibility; that the course pursued in a similar case by the Directors of Rennie's Line of Railway; that is, of causing a contract to be subscribed jointly by the transferrees of the shares of original subscribers, and such of the original subscribers as had not transferred their shares, and depositing a copy of such contract. The clause, however, in the Subscribers' Agreement in which it is stated that the provisional committee, before the obtaining of an Act of Parliament, will not recognise the transfer of shares, is inconsistent with the form of certificate issued by authority of the provisional committee, on which are printed the following words: "The holder of this certificate will be entitled to shares in the London and Brighton Railway Company, when the Act of Parliament shall have been obtained." That several members of the provisional committee have been trafficking largely

21747.

21871, 21872.

21742. 21744. 21746.

21871, 21872.

21747.

21751.

largely in the shares of this Company, appears clearly in evidence. The object of the clause in question, declaring that transfers shall not be recognised until an Act of Parliament shall have been obtained, was not, it has been stated by
21966. 21972. officers of the Company, to prevent the sale and transfer of shares, but in all matters concerning the interests of the Company, prior to obtaining the Act of Parliament, to enable the Company to look to the original subscribers only.
21974. Had the transfer prior to obtaining an Act been recognised, that might have been a reason in equity for releasing the original subscriber from his liability.
21953. On the passing of the Act, the Company would advertise for parties to come
21942. in and register their shares; the Directors might then adopt either the original subscriber or, should they think proper, the then holder of the original sub-
21944. 21946. scriber's share. Until the Directors chose to accept the holder of the share, by registering him, the original subscriber for a share was liable for 5*l.* before the passing of the Act, and, after the passing of the Act, for any calls unpaid upon that share, until he should assign the same conformably to the conditions of the
2196. Act. Under the Deed, the original subscriber was the only person liable until the Act was obtained, and the only person who has a claim to be registered. After the Act is obtained, the Act itself provides how assignments shall be made. Should the holder, on the passing of the Act, not be adopted by the Di-
21575. 22426. 22576. rectors, he would have his remedy against the original subscriber. Every share being numbered, there is no difficulty in enabling the holder to trace out the original subscriber as the person he is to look to for making the assignment.
21953. When the holder was registered, the original subscriber would be released from
22273. his liability. It was necessary the original subscriber should be responsible to
22280. 22375. the Company, for neither the Company nor the original subscriber has any means of compelling the person to whom before the passing of the Act of Parliament a share was transferred to come in after the passing of the Act and to register the same.

By the passing of the Bill which consolidates the Subscription Lists of the different Brighton Lines of Railway into one Subscription List, Your Committee feel themselves relieved from the necessity of pronouncing any opinion on the validity of the general grounds of objection raised to this particular List.

To this, their last Report, Your Committee have appended a Table of the different Subscribers, with the sums annexed severally subscribed by them, whom it has appeared proper to Your Committee to omit from the Subscription Contracts which they have examined.

17 *July* 1837.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Lunæ, 10° *die Julii*, 1837.

Present,

MR. WARBURTON IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Chalmers.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.

Report read, considered and agreed to.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Martis, 6° die Junii, 1837.

Mr. Richard Till - - - - - - - - - p. 1
William Vizard, Esq. - - - - - - - - - p. 16
Mr. William Routh - - - - - - - - - p. 21

Mercurii, 7° die Junii, 1837.

Mr. William Routh - - - - - - - - - p. 28
Mr. Isaac Lyon Goldsmid - - - - - - - - p. 28
Mr. William Crawshay - - - - - - - - p. 34
Mr. Lewis Michael Simon - - - - - - - - p. 38
Mr. Richard Lambert Jones - - - - - - - p. 42
William Vizard, Esq. - - - - - - - - - p. 44
Mr. Leonard Redmayne - - - - - - - - p. 45
Thomas Webber - - - - - - - - - - p. 47
Mr. James Leman - - - - - - - - - - p. 48

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Martis, 6° die Junii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.
Mr. Forster.
Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Thornely.
Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

LONDON AND BRIGHTON RAILWAY (STEPHENSON'S LINE).

The Petition of James Sebastian Yeats, Secretary of the Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway Company, was read.

Mr. *Clarkson* and Mr. *Alexander*, appeared in support of the Petition.

Mr. *Vizard*, on behalf of Stephenson's Line, stated, he did not intend to appear by Counsel.

The Petition of the Provisional Committee of Stephenson's Brighton Railway was read.

Mr. *Richard Till*, was called in; and Examined as follows:

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21550. Mr. *Clarkson.*] YOU are, I believe, the Secretary to a railway from the Southampton to Brighton, on a line laid down by George and Robert Stephenson?—I am.

21551. Called, in ordinary parlance, Stephenson's Line?—Yes.

21552. Were you the secretary for that company during the last session of Parliament?—From September 1835.

21553. Was that the period at which the speculation, or the company, was first formed?—No.

21554. When was the company first formed?—I do not know.

21555. Were you the secretary of the company before the first subscription deed was deposited in the Private Bill Office?—I was.

21556. Who was secretary before you?—I do not know; I do not believe there was any secretary; I really do not know

21557. From whom did you receive the papers deposited with you, as secretary?—From Messrs. Vizard & Leman, and from the committee of management.

21558. The provisional committee?—Yes.

21559. Have you got a prospectus of the company?—I have.

21560. Will you be so good as to allow me to see it; I mean of the company during the last session?—Yes, I have it.

21561. The first prospectus?—Yes. [*The same was handed to Mr. Clarkson.*]

21562. The capital was then 1,000,000 *l.*, in shares of 100 *l.* each, to the amount of 10,000, and the deposit 5 *l.* a share?—Yes, it was.

21563. The provisional committee were, Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, William Hitchens, Richard L. Jones, Thomas R. Kemp, a Member of this Honourable House, Captain John Lawrence, the Honourable Mr. Melville, Robert Murray, Edward Howley Palmer, William Routh and Henry Templer; they were the London provisional committee?—Yes, they were.

21564. Now, the Brighton railway committee consisted of Isaac Newton Wigney, a Member of this House, George Harrington, John Mills, and the high constable of Brighton?—Yes.

21565. Who was the high constable?—John Yeates.

Mr. Richard Till.

6 June 1837.

21566. The bankers in London were, Messrs. Williams, Deacon & Co., and Messrs. Cocks, Biddulph & Co.?—Yes.

21567. And at Brighton, Messrs. Wigney & Co.?—Yes.

21568. Have you before you a list of the present London provisional committee?—Yes, I have.

21569. Be so good as to read of whom they consist?—The Right hon. the Lord Mayor, Edward Blount, William Crawshay, James Forster, Adam Gordon, William Hitchens, Richard Lambert Jones, John Lawrence, the Hon. John Thornton, Leslie Melville, Robert Murray, George Probyn, William Routh, Thomas Allen Shuter, Henry Frederick Stephenson, Henry Templer, William Venables.

21570. Is that the alderman?—Yes.

21571. Have you got the Brighton provisional committee?—No; there is no present Brighton provisional committee.

21572. Can you furnish me with the number of the London Provisional Committee?—Sixteen.

21573. Do you call them directors?—No, they are the provisional committee.

21574. Have you a prospectus also of the speculation for this session?—No, I have not.

21575. Are there any printed?—We did not print one.

21576. Has the provisional committee of which you have given us a list just now, been changed since the second deposit of the copy of the deed in the Private Bill Office, or before?—Before.

21577. Does the provisional committee now remain as it was when the second copy of the subscription deed was deposited in the Private Bill Office?—Yes, it does.

21578. Am I to understand that the scheme, as laid down in the prospectus before us, and which was presented to the Committee in the last session, is in substance the same as at present?—Just the same; when you say in substance, you mean the capital and so forth.

21579. Yes, and the line?—There is a slight difference in the line, which has been explained before the Committee; the terminus differs, but in other respects it is one and the same concern.

21580. Will you be so good as to explain to the Committee the mode in which you proceeded in the last session to allot shares?—I was not secretary when the shares were allotted; when I became secretary, certain rough lists were delivered to me, and from which I made up the allotment-book.

21581. Had the shares been in point of fact allotted before the month of September 1835?—Yes, they had.

21582. Are you able to tell the Committee through whose instrumentality the shares had been originally allotted?—By the gentlemen who acted as the provisional committee before the company was established, with the assistance of Messrs. Vizard and Leman.

21583. Are you able to tell us who the person was that communicated from time to time with the parties applicants for shares, if any did, the portions allotted to them?—No.

21584. Do you not know it from the possession of the papers you now hold?—No.

21585. Have you any reason to believe under what circumstances, and by whom, those shares were represented to have been allotted in the first instance?—I hardly understand the question.

21586. I want to know the gentleman who acted as secretary to communicate to the parties the shares allotted to them?—I believe there was no secretary; but I believe Messrs. Vizard and Leman performed the duty that usually devolves upon the secretary.

21587. Are you able to say that there were parties who communicated to the applicants for shares the portions that the committee chose to allot them?—No, I do not know whether it was communicated by the individual members of the committee, or by Messrs. Vizard and Leman.

21588. But when you came into the office of the secretary the allotments had been, in point of fact, made?—They had.

21589. Had the scrip, or any of it at that time, been exchanged?—Not any of it.

21590. Will you be so good as to explain to the Committee what was the form of exchanging the scrip, and subscribing the deed, after the allotments had been made?—

made?—Each person received a letter, a circular, stating the number of shares that had been allotted.

21591. From whom?—It was signed by Messrs. Vizard and Leman.

21592. That is what we should call a letter of appropriation?—Yes; and they were called upon to pay the deposit of 5 *l.* per share at one of the banker's therein named; and upon production of that receipt to the secretary, and signing the deed, the scrip was delivered to them.

21593. Whose duty was it to deliver the scrip?—Mine.

21594. Have you a sort of talon-book?—Yes, I have.

21595. Do you happen to have with you one of the books used upon the first occasion?—Yes, I have.

[*The Witness produced the same.*]

21596. Where was the deed signed?—The majority of the signatures was taken at the office of the company in Cornhill, and a deed was also sent to Brighton, to be signed by such of the subscribers as lived at Brighton, and some few who happened to be at Brighton at the time.

21597. Will your talon-book enable you to tell the Committee the different periods at which the different applicants, to whom shares were appropriated, actually received them?—Yes.

21598. Allow us to look at it?—[*It was handed to Mr. Clarkson*].

21599. The talon-book is headed with a description of the railway, and contains the number or order in which the shares are delivered, the number of the certificate itself, the number of the shares, to whom shares are delivered, and the date of their delivery?—Yes.

21600. *Chairman.*] Then the date given in the talon-book would inform you of the date of the signing of the deed, would it not?—It would in almost every instance; there may have been one or two exceptions, but I have the date at which period every man's shares were delivered to him in 99 times out of 100; the party came, brought the banker's receipt, signed the deed, and took his certificates.

21601. At the same time?—At the same time.

21602. Mr. *Clarkson.*] We have spoken, among other contents of this book, of the number of the certificate?—Yes.

21603. Am I right in assuming that the number of the certificate continues the same number, where the shares are taken more than five by the same party?—Yes, in this instance I have observed it, but it is not always observed; the number 187 is the banker's number; number 1 to 5 was delivered to Alexander Mill the 15th of October, although the banker's number 187 comprised 10 shares, and consequently the numbers were repeated on the certificate.

21604. And it is the same upon the next number?—Yes, it is.

21605. *Chairman.*] It is not always so?—No, I think not; I may have omitted it when I was hurried.

21606. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Will there be on the certificate in the hands of the holder a corresponding number with the banker's number?—No.

21607. Then is there any number or other writing upon the certificate of the share that will identify it with the talon itself now remaining?—Yes, the number of the certificate; this is the certificate number, from 1 to 5; 187 is the banker's number.

21608. *Chairman.*] Each share is numbered?—They were in five shares; therefore Nos. 1 to 5 contain the certificate of five shares.

21609. There is not only the number given in the certificate, but in the certificate the shares are numbered; for instance, the first talon of a certificate in this book is 187, five shares, 1 to 5; the second talon is the certificate No. 187, five shares, 6 to 10; are the numbers of the shares in those two certificates, 1 to 5 and 6 to 10, expressed upon those two certificates, of which we have here the talons?—They are.

21610. The certificate is not only numbered, but contains the numbers of the shares?—Yes.

21611. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you got a blank certificate?—Yes, I have.

21612. Is the Committee to understand that the banker's number, 187, will appear upon the certificate?—Not upon the face of the certificate; the number that appears upon the face of the certificate is from 1 to 5. As a proper check to myself, I put on the talon the number of the banker's receipt brought to me as

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

an authority to deliver the shares. If a man brought me a receipt for 10 shares, I delivered him two certificates for five each: we had a few certificates in ones.

21613. Is it in this part of the certificate that it will appear; from 5 to 1, or 6 to 10?—Yes.

21614. *Chairman.*] Instead of being the number of the certificate, it is the number of each share comprehended in that certificate?—Yes.

21615. Mr. *Clarkson.*] The shares will show the number granted to the individual and the order in which they are granted; if a man applies the 15th of October, he will have some of the first issued?—Each share is numbered, and it will appear upon the certificate what was the number of the shares.

21616. Then, are the Committee to understand that the share itself will enable you to know at what time it was issued?—Yes, certainly.

21617. And the talon which you keep as a check for yourself will enable you to know to whom it was delivered?—Yes, it will.

21618. Can you tell the Committee what number of shares were originally applied for?—No, I cannot.

21619. Can you tell the Committee what proportion of shares were allotted?—Nine thousand.

21620. Out of 10,000?—Yes, out of 10,000.

21621. Can you tell us the proportion taken by the provisional committee upon the first occasion?—The book is not here. I can tell you presently; it will be here in a minute.

21622. Then let me ask you this question: supposing that a proprietor of shares, either on the provisional committee or not, had in the first instance subscribed the deed for a certain number of shares, the period at which he took those shares being apparent to you from the examination of the talon, in case he should have taken those shares into the market between the time of the first deposit of a copy of the deed and the second deposit of a copy of the deed, would you be enabled to tell us, by seeing those shares, at what time they were taken?—Yes.

21623. For instance, you could tell us whether any certain number of shares produced to-day or to-morrow by any gentleman had been delivered before the deposit of the first copy of the deed or the second?—Yes, unless any circumstance should have happened in the general mode of keeping the book, and I had omitted making such an entry; I ought to be able to tell you, if I have correctly done what I have intended to do.

21624. Do you know at all of your own knowledge, or from any information from any of the provisional committee, whether any of the shares of this railway were in the stock-market between the period of the depositing the first copy of the subscription deed and the second?—No, I cannot answer that; I know from public report that Stephenson's shares were dealt in; I know no more.

21625. Forgive me for asking, have you any shares yourself?—No, I have no shares myself.

21626. Have you had?—Yes, I have had.

21627. When were you first the holder of shares?—When the Bill was thrown out in the House of Lords I bought a few shares, about 15; but I soon sold them again: I thought it was incompatible for me to hold them in my situation.

21628. Did you buy them in the stock-market?—Yes.

21629. Was that after the Bill was stopped in the House of Lords?—Yes, it was; I bought 15.

21630. What was the price paid for them?—I gave 4 for them.

21631. Four premium?—No, one discount; 4*l.* instead of 5*l.*

21632. When did you part with them?—I think I did not hold them a month.

21633. Did they get better?—Yes, they did.

21634. You will not think it curious for me to ask what you got for them?—I made 9*l.* by them, after deducting the 1*l.* for the brokerage.

21635. Can you now tell me how many shares were held by the provisional committee?—Yes, I can; I make 2,854 taken by the provisional committee.

Mr. *Vizard.*] You must be wrong.

21636. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Mr. Goldsmid took 1,390, you know?—It is 2,924.

21637. That makes 292,400*l.*?—Yes.

21638. Now be so good as to give us the names and amounts?—Mr. Goldsmid, 1,300 shares; William Hitchins, 182; Mr. Jones, 172; Captain Lawrence, 132;

Mr.

Mr. Melville, 167; Mr. Murray, 210; Edward Howley Palmer, 82; William Routh, 222; Henry Templer, 242; Edward Blount, 25; Isaac Newton Wigney, 25; George Harrington, 25; John Mills, 25; John Yeats, 25.

21639. Do you happen to have got your original subscription deed here?—Yes, I have.

21640. Will you allow me to look at it for a moment?—[*It was handed to Mr. Clarkson.*]

21641. This is the Parliamentary contract?—Yes.

21642. The subscribers' agreement I wish to see?—[*It was handed to Mr. Clarkson.*]

21643. It is in duplicate; one is sent into the country?—They are two separate agreements.

21644. Not the same thing; one sent into the country?—No; one is full and the other is a continuation of it.

21645. Can you give me the name of the broker of whom you bought, or to whom you sold, your 15 shares?—I think it was Mr. Manning.

21646. Where does he live; did you deal with him on both occasions?—I had only one occasion.

21647. You bought and sold?—Yes.

21648. On both occasions you employed him?—Yes.

21649. Where does Mr. Manning live?—I do not know where he lives; he is on the Stock Exchange.

21650. Is he a member of the house?—Yes, he is.

21650*. *Chairman.*] You mean the Stock Exchange house?—

21651. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Yes, as contradistinguished from the out-door work. Were any shares reserved under the first deed?—There were 1,000 shares not appropriated.

21652. Have they been yet appropriated?—The shares now not appropriated are 593.

21653. I think it was the 15th of October 1835 your deed was deposited, or September 1835?—In November, I think; no, February 1836 it was.

21654. *Chairman.*] Can you give the date of it?—No, I cannot; the Parliamentary agent deposited it.

21655. Mr. *Alexander.*] There is something further than this deed; this is full of signatures; there is another beyond it?—Here is the contract [*handing it to Mr. Alexander*].

21656. *Chairman.*] Four hundred and seven of the reserved shares have been appropriated?—Yes.

21657. Mr. *Clarkson.*] To how many persons have those been appropriated?—I do not think I could tell that.

21658. Have they been recently appropriated?—No, they have not; the last appropriation must have been, I think, in November 1836. It was not material for me to keep an account of the date of the appropriation, so that I am not in a condition to answer it.

21659. *Chairman.*] The talon-book will show?—Yes, when they were delivered; but the date of the appropriation I have not busied myself to find.

21660. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you told us whether the money was paid at the banker's or the office?—Always at the banker's.

21661. Have all the shares for which the original deed was subscribed been taken up?—By "taking up" you mean deposits paid?

21662. No, shares taken up. Have all the certificates been delivered for which the deeds had been subscribed?—No; I have in my possession certificates for which the deed has been signed, and which have not been delivered.

21663. *Chairman.*] And the deposits paid?—Yes.

21664. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Give us the names and number of shares?—T. Allan Shuter, 25 shares; that is all, I think.

21665. Only 25 to Mr. Shuter?—That is all.

21666. Are there any shares or certificates remaining in your hand, or not delivered to the party, where the deed has not been subscribed?—Yes.

21667. *Chairman.*] That is, the deed has not been subscribed, but the deposits have been paid?—Yes, that is the case; the deed has not been subscribed, but the deposits have been paid: John Sanderson, Philpot-lane, 30 shares; Richard L. Jones, 10 shares.

 21668. That

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21668. That is the same Richard L. Jones, one of the provisional committee?—Yes. John Coldbatch, of Brighton, one share; the Honourable Frankland Lewis, five shares; Lewis Levi, 10 shares; William Routh, 90 shares.

21669. That is the same William Routh who is on the provisional committee?—Yes; and Sir David Scott, one share.

21670. Will you be so good as to tell us, if you can, when the deposits were paid upon the shares of those persons you have last enumerated?—The Honourable Frankland Lewis paid his deposit the 3d of October 1835; Mr. Jones paid his deposit May the 4th 1836; Mr. Coldbatch paid his deposit the 2d of November 1835; Mr. Sanderson paid his deposit November 11th 1835; Mr. Lewis Levi paid his deposit the 15th of February 1836; Mr. Routh paid his deposit October 11th 1836; Sir David Scott, November the 10th 1835.

21671. Now are there any shares in your hands, or in the hands of the company, not taken up, where neither the deposits have been paid, or the subscription deed executed, except the reserved shares; you say you reserved 1,000 shares, they were for the land-owners on the line?—Yes.

21672. With the exception of those shares purposely reserved, of the shares appropriated, the 9,000, are there any in the hands of the company for which parties have neither subscribed the deed nor paid the deposit?—Yes, James Chandler, of Epsom, two shares; John Johnson, of Milbank, 25 shares.

21673. *Chairman.*] They were allotted to them, and have not been disposed of to other parties?—No; they have not come to sign the deed, nor have they paid the deposits; they remain under seal in the banker's hands.

21674. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you now enumerated all the shares that remain unappropriated, and not in the hands of the supposed holders?—Yes, I have.

21675. Are there any parties amongst those you have last enumerated, who have subscribed the deed, but not paid the deposit?—No.

21676. Then, if I understand, they consist of persons to whom some shares have been appropriated out of the reserved 1,000; they consist of others where the parties have subscribed the deed, and paid the deposit, but have not taken up the shares, and persons who have paid the deposit, but have not subscribed the deed?—Yes.

21677. But are there any instances of persons who have subscribed the deed, but not paid the deposits?—No, none.

21678. *Chairman.*] The paying the deposit was made a necessary condition of their signing the deed?—Nobody signed the deed unless he produced a receipt, showing he had paid the deposit.

21679. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Then, in point of fact, are there any persons who have signed the deed who have not paid the deposit, to your knowledge?—Certainly I know of none.

21680. Was that invariably the case, that the persons who had signed the deed had previously paid the deposit, or did any of them pay the deposit afterwards?—I know of no instance in which I have a minute of it; I cannot say what took place at Brighton, but I believe none took place there; and I know of no case in which a person was allowed to sign the deed unless he had paid the deposit.

21681. Will you tell us whether any of the 9,000 shares were allotted to persons who did not apply for them?—No, I cannot do that.

21682. Have the persons whose names are not to the subscription deed, and who have paid the deposit, been applied to, to your knowledge, at any time to subscribe the deed?—No, nobody has by me been applied to.

21683. Or by anybody else, to your knowledge?—No; there are so few, I did not pay much attention to them.

21684. Is it true there are 66,400*l.* not subscribed for in the second copy of the subscription deed that was subscribed for in the first?—No.

21685. Are there in amount 66,400*l.* in value of shares subscribed for by persons for others, in the printed copy of the first subscription deed, that do not appear upon the second?—If you have got a correct copy, it is 66,900*l.*; I believe it to be correct.

21686. Now, will you be so good as to tell the Committee when the second subscription deed went into the Private Bill Office?—No, I cannot.

21687. What month was it?—February 1837; I did not deposit it.

21688. *Chairman.*] Who deposited it?—The Parliamentary agent, Mr. Heyward, and Mr. Leman took charge of that part of the business.

21689. Mr.

21689. Mr. *Clarkson*.] Have you got the deed, a copy of which was deposited in February 1837?—Yes.

21690. I want you to point out to me the names to which I have referred you, amounting to 66,000*l*. and a fraction, that appear upon the first deed?—I have some.

21691. I am asking you whether those persons' names appear upon the deed itself?—Yes, they do upon a deed.

21692. Which deed?—A separate deed; not upon the deed you hold in your hand, but upon a separate deed.

21693. Is it a continuation of the same deed?—No, a separate deed, in consequence of the advice of the solicitors that all persons who signed by procuration or agency should sign a separate deed, which I hold in my hand.

21694. Am I to understand that there is no difference, in fact, between the first and second deed in their contents?—I know of no difference.

21695. *Chairman*.] That deed contains the names of all the parties that signed by procuration?—Yes, it does.

21696. Mr. *Clarkson*.] These being persons signing by procuration to the amount which I have stated, they have signed a distinct deed?—Yes, they do.

21967. No part of the same deed at all?—No, none whatever.

21968. Separate and distinct?—Yes.

21699. And forming no part of the first or second deed?—There are three, I think. Numbers 1, 2 and 3 are duplicates; they are, in short, one deed. They are in three distinct folds of parchment, but purporting to be a continuation of each other; then there is No. 4, which is entirely distinct.

21700. Then do you know when, if ever, the copy of the deed I now hold in my hand, No. 4, found its way to the Private Bill Office?—I do not know, because I did not deposit it; but a copy of that deed was deposited, as I understood, and I assisted in the direction both in the last session of Parliament and in the present session.

21701. Who was the person to deposit it, in fact?—Mr. Leman took charge of it, and deposited the deed with the Parliamentary agent.

21702. You understood the act to be that of Mr. Leman and the Parliamentary agent?—Yes.

21703. Which?—I believe they both went together; I believe so; I do not know the fact, but I believe it to be so.

21704. Then, is the Committee to understand that the manner in which the second application to Parliament was preceded was this, with regard to the Private Bill Office, that another copy of the same 1, 2 and 3 deed, with another copy of a distinct deed, No. 4, was made for the present session, as had been made for the former?—So I understand.

21705. With the addition of the nine persons who have become subscribers since the last session?—No, I do not make nine; I only make seven.

21706. Then, with the addition of the new subscribers since the last session?—Yes, exactly.

21707. Are you able to give us any information of the circumstances under which it happens, that the persons subscribing No. 4 do not appear in the printed list, as any part of that delivered into the Private Bill Office?—I am not able to give you any information.

21708. Will you be so good as to explain shortly to the Committee the mode in which the provisional committee proceeded to take the sense of the proprietors, as to the second application to Parliament this session, after the House of Lords had voted as your petition has described?—A general meeting was called.

21709. Can you tell us when it was?—It was in August, in the year 1836; I thought the date appeared in this circular I hold in my hand.

21710. What is that circular?—It was addressed to the subscribers to the deed in November 1836.

21711. Was it after the general meeting?—Yes.

21712. By what means were the general body assembled in August?—By letter sent to them.

21713. Have you a copy of it?—No.

21714. There will be no difficulty in furnishing it?—No.

21715. Was there any prospectus, or any other document, laid before the general body?—No prospectus was laid before them.

21716. Was there any general statement laid before them?—There was no paper,

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

paper, or anything you can call a statement; the chairman of the committee made his *vivâ voce* statement.

21717. Who was the chairman?—Mr. Routh.

21718. Who was the deputy chairman?—No deputy chairman.

21719. Were the accounts of the company laid before the meeting?—No, they were not.

21720. Were they referred to at all?—Yes, they were slightly referred to.

21721. Was the state of the funds explained?—Only in a general point of view, that the assets would be sufficient to warrant a second application to Parliament without any further call.

21722. Has that turned out to be so, in point of fact?—I am not able to answer that question in that way.

21723. You have said that it was stated, at the general meeting, that the assets would be sufficient to warrant a second application to Parliament in the next session; have they been so?—Do you mean to say, have we money left?

21724. Yes?—Yes, we have.

21725. Have the assets, then, left in your hand been sufficient?—I am sure I cannot tell you.

21726. Who keeps the accounts?—I keep the accounts; but I cannot tell what the expenses will ultimately be.

21727. I want to know whether they have been sufficient?—If the question is, whether we have money left in our hands, I say yes.

21728. After payment of all your obligations?—Yes.

Mr. *Vizard* stated, there was nothing in the petition upon the subject of the accounts.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, in the former case it had been proved that Rennie's company was 8,000*l.* in debt, and therefore he had a right to go into the inquiry.

Mr. *Vizard* stated, that that fact was mentioned in the Petition in that case.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that it was not.

The *Chairman* stated, that it was a matter of not much importance for the Committee to inquire into.

21729. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Can you tell the Committee the state of the accounts at the time of the general meeting?—Yes, I can, generally.

21730. Be so good as to do so?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question, on the ground of its being an examination into the details of the accounts of the company, there being no allegation in the petition upon the subject.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that the constitution of this Committee had arisen from an allegation that a variety of bubbles were in existence, and the general drift of the inquiries had been to ascertain whether there were any funds for carrying the schemes into effect; and as to Rennie's Brighton Line, Mr. Vizard's partner had proved the amount of the debt of the company.

Mr. *Vizard*, in reply, stated, that there was nothing in the petition that had any reference to the present state of the accounts of Stephenson's Company.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that one of the allegations in the petition was, that the conduct of the directors was calculated to encourage gambling.

The *Chairman* stated, that that allegation did not come entirely within the province of the Committee.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that having reminded the Committee of the course taken on a former occasion, he would leave it with the Chairman to decide what course should be pursued; that he was personally very much disinclined to pursue it.

The *Chairman* stated, that in the former case the balance in the hands of the directors was not inquired into.

21731. *Chairman.*] Had you a balance in hand, after paying the expenses of the previous session?—Yes.

21732. And you have not since made any new call?—No.

The *Chairman* stated, that this inquiry was not within the province of the Committee.

21733. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You were telling me that a general meeting was called, at which these circumstances were incidentally mentioned, the result of which was, an instruction to the provisional committee to go on with the application at the next session?—Yes.

21734. You have told me the day of the general meeting?—In August I told you.

21735. You say that Mr. Goldsmid has ceased to be on the provisional committee?—Yes.

21736. Is he the holder of shares, to your knowledge?—I do not know; the holder of certificates, you mean.

21737. Yes. Can you tell us when he resigned the situation of provisional committee-man?—The 21st of November 1836.

21738. You say that the line was altered on the second occasion; is it altered to go through a part of Mr. Goldsmid's own land.

The *Chairman* stated, he did not see that this point was relevant to the inquiry of the Committee.

21739. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Were the shares appropriated to the directors and delivered to them upon signing the deed and producing the banker's receip —Yes.

21740. They have never since been returned to the office at all?—No.

21741. Are you able, or could anybody tell at the time of the subscription, and of the handing in the copy of the subscription deed, in February last, whether the persons who subscribed it in February 1835 were, or any of them, still holders of the certificates of the company?—That is a very comprehensive question. I cannot tell of my own knowledge; but upon seeing the certificates in the possession of the parties, I had reason to believe that they were holders of certificates in the undertaking.

21742. Does the subscription deed itself contain an authority to the provisional committee to go on with the undertaking in any subsequent session of Parliament?—Yes, it does.

Chairman.] Read that clause.

Mr. *Vizard.*] After describing the railway, it says, "that it is to be constructed, established and conducted in such manner as shall be directed by any Act or Acts of Parliament that may be applied for and obtained in the next or any subsequent session or sessions of Parliament, either by the said committee for the time being, or after the first of such Acts, if more than one shall have passed, by the persons thereby authorized to act on behalf of the subscribers." Then there is an authority in the subsequent part of it to add to the numbers of the committee, and to vary the line.

Chairman.] It authorizes them to proceed in that or any subsequent session within certain limits.

Mr. *Vizard.*] There are no limits.

21743. *Chairman.*] Is it under that clause that the provisional committee of Stephenson's Line, in delivering in a copy of the list of subscribers to the Private Bill Office this session, delivered in a list of the names that were attached to the subscribers' agreement of the previous session, making only the additions of those persons who have since that period become new subscribers?—That is the case.

21744. They have done so under the authority of the original subscribers' agreement?—They have.

21745. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Then, in point of fact, there is no new subscription by any of the original subscribers since February 1836?—No, except seven.

21746. And a second copy of the deed of 1835 has been handed in, under the terms that have been read in this deed?—Yes.

21747. Can you turn to any proviso or covenant in the subscription deed I hold in my hand, precluding the provisional committee from making any new call before procuring the Act of Parliament, or in the subscribers' agreement?—Yes, that is the case.

Mr. *Vizard*: "No further deposit or sum shall be called for on account of the expenses, or otherwise, until the Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the same undertaking, or some part thereof, shall have been obtained."

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21748. Until the Act shall have been obtained for carrying into effect the line contemplated, or such parts as the Committee think proper, do you not know that your projected Bill contains a clause recognizing the transfer of shares, and making the holders who register alone liable?—No, I do not.

21749. Do you understand that in your Bill it is intended that, after the procuring of the Act of Parliament, the subscribers to the deed shall still remain liable?—I do not understand anything upon the subject, and therefore I give myself no trouble to think upon it.

21750. I see you are a gentleman of considerable information, and I thought you could give me some light upon the subject?—No, I have not troubled myself upon it.

21751. Have the goodness to read the terms of the rights of the parties in respect of the certificate; who is the person who has any rights or equities?—"The holder of this certificate will be entitled to one share in the London and Brighton Railway Company, when the Act of Parliament shall have been obtained." Signed by the members of the committee.

21752. Then would there be, to your knowledge, any person whatever entitled to anything, benefit or otherwise, arising out of your company's speculation, except the holder for the time being of the certificate?—I really decline to give any opinion upon the subject; it is a matter of law, and a subject that involves liabilities.

21753. Did you not consider, while you were the holder of the 15 shares that you purchased, that you were entitled to all the benefits, and liable to all the engagements?—I do not think I could say that.

21753*. Do you know anything of a company called the Birmingham and Derby Company?—I believe there was such a company as that.

21754. Do you know from Mr. Crawshay that he was a holder of shares in the Birmingham and Derby?—I never had any conversation with him upon that subject.

The *Chairman* stated, that the Committee could not go into an examination as to Mr. Crawshay's solvency.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that the allegation in the petition was, that parties had been gambling in shares.

The *Chairman* stated, that that should be shown with respect to the shares of this company.

21755. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you know whether there are any gentlemen who subscribed the deed in February 1836, who, before February 1837, had become unfortunate in business; do you know that?—No, I do not know one.

21756. I will just show you a name, for I do not like to mention it; this is a sort of proceeding I very much dislike. [*Showing a name to the Witness.*] I have shown you a name in the printed list?—Yes, you have.

21757. Did you know, before February 1837, that that gentleman had been unfortunate in business?—No, I did not; on the contrary, I think it is much later than that.

21758. You think the fact of his misfortune has been later than that?—Yes.

21759. Allow me to show you another?—[*Showing another name to the Witness.*]—Yes, I do recollect, by a public document, that that person was unfortunate before February 1837.

21760. *Chairman.*] The first case was for how many shares?—Mr. *Clarkson.*] 25 shares; and the second is 10 shares.

21761. Here is another?—[*Showing another name to the Witness.*]—Yes.

21762. Twenty-five shares?—That is a very late misfortune.

21763. Is that since February?—Yes, it is.

21764. Since the deposit of the second deed?—Yes, certainly.

21765. Mr. *Vizard.*] That alludes to all, except the 10 shares?—Yes.

21766. Mr. *Clarkson.*] I understand you are misinformed about the first I put to you; are you positive about it?—Yes, I certainly am; it is a thing that can easily be proved; my own opinion is, that it is considerably later than February 1837.

21767. Are you able at all, from the circumstance of the second copy of the subscription deed being a mere copy of the first, to explain to this Committee whether the majority of those gentlemen, whose names were subscribed in February 1836, may or may not be proprietors in this company at all?—If a witness

can

can form an opinion upon such subjects merely from common report, and his own belief of the matter, without any absolute knowledge, I should say they are, generally speaking, shareholders to as large an amount, if not a larger amount, than they were at the time they signed the deed; but I give that answer with all qualification.

21768. Are we to understand that, according to the means you have had of forming a judgment upon a fact, not known to you as a fact, you should consider that the majority of persons, directors and others, whose names are appended to the subscription deed of February 1836, are at present, in fact, *bonâ fide* possessors of shares to the same amount, or nearly so, as they appear for on the deed?—Yes, I do think so.

21769. Do you happen to have got a book in which you can turn to the scrip taken by Isaac Lyon Goldsmid?—I have got a copy of the book.

21770. Will you give us the numbers that appear on the talon, which will correspond with the certificate itself of the shares held by Isaac Lyon Goldsmid?—Mr. Vizard, am I to answer that question?

21771. Mr. *Vizard.*] I have no objection.—The reason why I put that is not out of any disinclination to answer your question; but I thought, giving evidence in this Committee about an individual's private property was objectionable.

Mr. *Clarkson,* till I came here I thought so too.

21772. *Chairman.*] It is the first name in the list of directors; and it seems to me to be a perfectly fair question; he is a subscriber for 120,000 *l.* in the printed list, and the first in the list of the direction?—4,506 to 5,840; 7,501 to 7,505; 8,069 to 8,073; 8,093 and 8,094; 9,906 to 9,935; 9,947 to 9,958; 9,995; that makes 1,390 shares.

21773. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Now will you be so good, by turning to any book that will enable you to do so, to give us the dates of the taking those shares respectively?—The first were taken October the 27th, 1835; the second, November the 27th, in the same year; the third, October the 26th, 1835; February the 13th, 1836, all the rest.

21774. Can you explain to us how it is that they do not run in sequences?—Yes, in delivering shares, in the very hurry of delivering them, it frequently happened I took up a book and took 100 shares out, and 10 were left; the next person that applied for 40, it suited me to take up a fresh book and give him 40; and the next man would take the other 10.

21775. Can you tell me this; I see the last number of shares was 9,995?—Yes.

21776. There were but 10,000 shares altogether, and there are 400 and odd shares at present unappropriated?—I will explain that to you. The greater proportion of the 10,000 shares were printed upon certificates of five; but it was necessary to have some few in ones, and they were numbered off to 9,999. The books so printed just reach that number: that was in fives and ones. When I delivered an odd number, I was obliged to go to the one talon-book to deliver it.

21777. Then I understand the explanation to be, that inasmuch as you had to go from the book containing five shares to the book containing one, there would remain shares in the one book or in the five book that would leave a difference between 9,955, which would appear to be the amount of the allotments and what was actually delivered?—Yes.

21778. They so remain?—Yes.

21779. I wish to know if you can give me the numbers, in order, of the shares taken by the next gentleman to Mr. Goldsmid, Mr. Hitchins; William Hitchins, what were the numbers to him?—266 to 315, 396 to 445, 356 to 375, 386 to 395.

21780. Now give me the dates of those several certificates?—They were all delivered the 15th of October.

21781. Now Richard Lambert Jones?—9,105 to 9,154; that was March 1836 they were delivered.

21782. Is that the whole?—No; 8,690 to 8,709, 9,959 to 9,960, that was delivered January 6th; 4,401 to 4,405, 6,001 to 6,005, 8,600 to 8,689, 6,511 to 6,515, 8,275 to 8,279.

21783. The dates of those?—October the 27th.

21784. All the rest?—Yes.

21785. The earlier numbers would be the earlier month?—Yes.

21786. When was the last month?—March 1836.

21787. Would that be a taking up of shares, after depositing the deed in the Private Bill Office?—Yes, it would.

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21788. Now, if you please, Thomas Reid Kemp?—He does not appear as a holder of shares; he has not any shares; he declined to take any shares.

21789. When did he secede from the committee?—He seceded in the end of the year 1835.

21790. Then take Captain Lawrence?—646 to 745, October 15th, 1835; 3,501, 3,530, and 8,011 and 8,012, October the 22d.

21791. Now we will go to the Honourable John Thomas Leslie Melville?—6,306 to 6,455, November 2d, 1835.

21792. The next, Robert Murray, esq.?—1,106 to 1,315, October the 16th, 1835.

21793. The next is Edward Howley Palmer?—6,491 to 6,505, 6,751 to 6,785, November 6th, 1835.

21794. Now William Routh, esq.?—2,841 to 3,050, October 19th, 1835.

21795. Is that all?—Yes.

21796. Has Mr. Routh no other shares?—Yes, 8,020 to 8,031, October 24th, 1835; 9,185 to 9,254, October 11th, 1836; 9,155 to 9,174, October 18th.

21797. Is that the whole?—Yes.

21798. Were not there some taken by Mr. Routh after the deed was deposited?—Yes, I have named them; October 1836.

21799. After the second deed?—No, none.

21800. Now Captain Templer?—3,136 to 3,345, October the 20th, 1835; 7,201 to 7,230, and 9,945 and 9,946, November the 6th, 1835.

21801. I do not think it will be necessary to trouble you with the Brighton ones; but give me the Right hon. the Lord Mayor, who is one of the provisional committee?—He is not a subscriber.

21802. How came the Lord Mayor to be put upon that paper as a subscriber?—It was known he held shares; that he had purchased shares, and held them.

21803. To whom was that known?—To the committee who put his name upon the provisional committee.

21804. Be so good as to tell us when his name was added to the provisional committee?—It was announced in a letter on the 14th November 1836.

21805. Have you a copy of that letter?—Yes, I have.

21806. Be so good as to let me see it?—[*It was handed to Mr. Clarkson.*]

21807. "Stephenson's Brighton Railway, Cornhill, the 14th November 1836;" this is a general circular, sent to the subscribers?—Yes.

21808. "Sir, I am directed, by the committee, to furnish you with a copy of the report addressed to them by Mr. Stephenson, from which it will be seen, that a careful re-examination of the line, and the most mature consideration of the whole subject, have only served to confirm his preference of the line originally recommended by him. Fortified with this opinion, and satisfied that, although a combination of interests prevailed in delaying the passing of the Bill, the merits of the line, and the benefit to be derived by the public from its early execution, will become too apparent to admit a doubt of its ultimate success, the committee will deposit the requisite plans on the 30th of November, and renew the application to Parliament in the next session. I have the pleasure to inform you, that the following gentlemen, holding a large interest in the company, have joined the committee: The Right hon. the Lord Mayor;" he has no shares at all, you say; "William Crawshay, esq., James Foster, esq., Adam Gordon, esq., Mr. Sheriff Johnson," who never took up his shares; "George Probyn, esq., Thomas Allen Shuter, esq., Henry Frederick Stephenson, esq., Mr. Alderman Venables. I am, Sir, your very obedient servant, *Richard Till*, Secretary." Turn over to the directors of the Brighton Railway Company, gentlemen.

Chairman.] It does not say that they have all newly acquired an interest in the concern.

Mr. *Clarkson.*] "I have the pleasure to inform you, that the following gentlemen, holding a large interest in the company, have joined the committee."

Chairman.] They may have been subscribers before.

21809. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Yes; have you had any communication with the Right hon. the Lord Mayor upon the subject of his interest in the concern?—No.

21810. Of your own knowledge, do you know that he is the holder of a single share?—I was informed he was.

21811. By whom?—By Alderman Venables.

21812. Mr.

21812. Mr. Sheriff Johnson is amongst this list of persons who held a large interest in the company; how many shares did he originally subscribe for; or did he ever subscribe at all?—He did not subscribe the deed.

21813. He has not taken up his shares?—He has not taken up the shares allotted to him.

21814. Yet you represent him as having a large interest in the concern?—Yes, I did.

21815. Why?—Because the committee understood he had an interest in it.

21816. Which of the committee?—I think it was Richard Lambert Jones.

21817. *Chairman.*] Were the allottees of shares the parties required to sign the subscription deed?—In every instance.

21818. And those only?—Yes, those only.

21819. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Has Mr. Probyn taken up his shares?—Yes; he has signed the deed.

21820. Has he taken up his shares?—Yes, and paid the deposit.

21821. Has he taken up his shares?—I believe they are in my possession; I beg your pardon; I think I have made a mistake; I see 50 certificates were delivered to Mr. Probyn, October the 19th, 1835.

21822. There is a gentleman of the name of Edward Blount added to that provisional committee?—Yes, he is an original member.

21823. I think not; he is not an original member here; now be so good as to tell us the number of his shares?—The numbers of the certificates of his shares are 8,380 to 8,404; and they were delivered to him December 5th, 1835.

21824. Those are the only shares?—Yes.

21825. Now Mr. Crawshay, if you please?—William Crawshay?

21826. Yes; I mean the partner of Mr. Routh?—2,691 to 2,740, October 19th, 1835; 5,916 to 5,965, October 31st, 1835.

21827. Has he taken none since that?—No.

21828. Mr. James Forster?—James Forster, 2,196 to 2,235, October 16th, 1835.

21829. Adam Gordon?—Adam Gordon, 171 to 230, October 15th, 1835.

21830. Is that all?—Yes.

21831. Thomas Allen Shuter?—8,810 to 8,829, February 10th, 1836; 9,280 to 9,284, November 15th, 1836.

21832. I am told I have made a mistake, and that we have not got George Probyn?—Captain George Probyn. I have given those; am I to give them again?

21833. Not if you have given them?—2,771 to 2,821, October 19th, 1835; that is all.

21834. Henry Frederick Stephenson?—9,255 to 9,279, November 14th, 1836.

21835. Alderman Venables?—5,966 to 5,990, October 31st, 1835.

31836. Mr. Sheriff Johnson?—He has not taken up any; they are not taken from me; the deposits are not paid.

21837. Nor the deed subscribed?—No.

21838. Sheriff Johnson's name is appended to this list, in consequence of some representation made by a member of the committee that he was a holder of some shares?—That is not my evidence.

21839. I thought it was?—You say his name was appended to this list in consequence of its being told me that he was a large holder of shares.

21840. Yes?—That was not the reason.

21841. What was it?—That was in the breast of the committee.

21842. Have you any reason to know why his name was appended to it?—Because he was an active intelligent gentleman, and took an interest in the concern.

21843. Do you mean taking an interest in the concern as contra-distinguished from a shareholder?—He took an interest in the welfare of this undertaking.

21844. Were those gentlemen written to before this circular was sent, to know whether they accepted the appointment?—I do not know; I cannot answer that question. They were not written to by me as a matter of form, but the secretary took the orders of the committee.

21845. To your knowledge, strictly speaking, you do not know that any application was made to them at all, unless you made it yourself?—I did not.

21846. Whether the Right honourable the Lord Mayor accepted the appointment as one of the committee, and joined the committee, you do not know?—I only know from the representation of the committee, that it was done.

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

21847. Who stated that?—The individual member of the committee who recommended him to be added.

21848. Who was it?—The individual gentleman do you mean?

21849. Yes?—I think it was Mr. Jones that communicated with the Lord Mayor.

21850. And that the Lord Mayor accepted the office of committee-man?—Yes.

21851. Who applied to Mr. Sheriff Johnson, do you know?—No, I do not.

21852. Then are we to understand that it was the intention of the company, through you, their secretary, to represent when you say, "I have the pleasure to inform you that the following gentlemen, holding a large interest in the company, have joined the committee," that they were holders of shares, or that they wished well to the company?—I should say that it was intended to convey by that that they were holders of shares.

21853. With respect to Mr. Johnson the fact was otherwise?—No, I believe not; I believe he was a holder of shares.

21854. That he had obtained them by purchase?—Yes.

21855. From whose information do you obtain that?—From general conversation in the committee-room; I do not know that I can say who.

21856. Those circulars were sent without any assurance to you that those gentlemen had accepted the office, or were proprietors of shares?—Not by the individuals themselves.

21857. Their names were appended to this letter in consequence of the representations made to you by members of the committee from time to time, that those several gentlemen were holders of shares, though not subscribers to the deed, and as such had an interest in the concern, and had joined the committee?—Yes.

21858. Was that letter sent after the general meeting?—Yes.

21859. Has there been any circular sent to the subscribers since that period?—No.

21860. The provisional committee now stands much in the same situation as they did then?—Yes.

21861. Can you tell the Committee, in a table, as you say you can distinguish the dates at which the several shares of the subscribers were taken up; can you be so good as to point out to the Committee such shares as were taken in the month of February 1836?—It would be a work of time; I must look through 200 or 300 names.

21862. It can be done between this and to-morrow?—Yes. Do you wish it to be done now?

21863. No.

The *Chairman* stated, that upon further consideration it appeared to him desirable that the Committee should be put in possession of some information with respect to the balance remaining in the hands of the provisional committee at the termination of the proceedings in Parliament in the last session.

Mr. *Vizard* was heard to observe upon the suggestion thrown out by the Chairman.

Mr. *Clarkson* was heard in answer to the observations of Mr. Vizard.

The Committee-room was cleared.

After some time the counsel and parties were again called in, and informed by the Chairman that the opinion of the Committee was, that the question should be put, what was the remaining balance after the expenses of the preceding session had been paid.

21864. Mr. *Clarkson*, to Mr. *Till.*] Be so good as tell the Committee what was the balance remaining in the hands of the company, after the expenses and liabilities of the first application to Parliament?—It was about 9,000 *l.*

21865. Will you be so good as to turn to your book, and tell me the shares allotted to Mr. Vizard?—No. 7,271 to 7,345, delivered November 20th, 1835.

21866. Was that all?—Yes, that comprises 75 shares, which is all that Mr. Vizard took, 75 shares.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

21867. What was the amount of the estimate?—The amount of the estimate was 1,000,000 *l.*, and the amount for which the deeds are signed, Nos. 1, 2 and 3, is 861,400 *l.*

21868. *Chairman.*]

21868. *Chairman.*] That is excluding those signed by procuration?—Yes.

21869. Mr. *Vizard.*] When you say a million, have you taken it from the prospectus, or is that the estimate according to the engineer's evidence?—It is something less upon the engineer's evidence.

21870. Do you know whether any shares were issued and a premium received on them, and brought to the credit of the company?—Certainly not; no premium beyond the deposit.

21871. Does the subscriber's contract provide that the provisional committee and directors will not recognize any transfer of shares before the Act of Parliament is obtained?—Yes, it does.

21872. I will thank you to read that clause?—"That the said provisional committee will not recognize the transfer of any share or shares in the said undertaking until the Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the said undertaking, or some part thereof, shall have been obtained."

21873. Were you instructed by the solicitor that no party was to be allowed to sign the Parliamentary contract, except he came in person, or produced a letter of attorney?—That was my instructions; and no person was allowed to sign the Parliamentary contract unless he came personally, as the owner.

21874. Or produced a regular letter of attorney?—Yes.

21875. *Chairman.*] You say the owner; you mean the allottee, the person to whom the shares had been allotted by the provisional committee?—Yes, that is what I mean.

21876. Mr. *Vizard.*] To provide for persons who had shares allotted to them, and, living at a distance, could not attend to sign the deed, was a separate deed prepared to meet that case?—There was.

21877. Was that to avoid the expense of sending the other deed round the country, or the expense that parties would have been put to if they had procured letters of attorney?—That was the reason given.

21878. Were you always given to understand that the signatures to that deed were never to be calculated upon as coming within the subscribers under the Standing Orders of the House of Commons?—It was so understood.

21879. Is the amount subscribed to the deeds, independent of that deed, sufficient to meet the Standing Orders?—Yes, it is.

21880. Even with reference to that deed, in all cases, were written authorities produced by the parties who signed it?—In every instance.

21881. Do you know whether any attempts were made to induce people to become subscribers?—Certainly not.

21882. If it is stated in a petition to the House of Commons, or in any other way, that shares were issued at a premium, is it true or false?—It is false; the premium must mean more than the deposit; that is false.

21883. Do you know whether that deed contains the usual provision to add to the number of the committee, and to vary the line?—Yes, it does.

21884. You say there are a certain number of persons who paid their deposits, and have not signed the deed, and you have quoted the names of Jones and Routh, two of the members of the committee; they have signed for a considerable number, notwithstanding?—Yes, they have.

21885. Can you speak, generally, to the character of the parties who have signed the original subscription deed?—From what information I have been able to obtain, from many years' knowledge of the city of London, I should say it is a very highly respectable deed; and I have been confirmed in that by other and better judges than I am.

21886. Upon looking through the list, is there any one you should reject, if he was to tender himself to sign now?—No, not taking his position at that time, there is no gentleman I should have objected to.

[Re-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*]

21887. You read to us just now a clause in the subscribers' deed that "they would not recognise the transfer of any shares until the passing of the Act;" was that the subject matter of discussion by the provisional committee?—Not in my presence.

21888. Was that subject ever discussed by the committee themselves, and the propriety of it?—I do not recollect that it was.

21889. That was in the deed of 1835?—Yes.

21890. You were the purchaser of some shares that had been transferred after the

Mr. *Richard Till.*

6 June 1837.

the deed had been executed?—I purchased some certificates of shares that had not been recognized by the company,

21891. You became a purchaser, and transferred shares after the execution of the deed, and the company would not recognise the transfer?—Yes, I became a purchaser of certificates.

21892. They would not be shares till the Act passed?—No.

21893. Therefore the deed referred to certificates, and not shares?—Yes.

21894. Do you know from Mr. Vizard who prepared that deed?—It was prepared in his office.

21895. Do you not know from Mr. Vizard, after he prepared that deed with this clause he transferred his own shares?—I have only just heard it admitted by Mr. Vizard in this room; I did not know it before.

21896. Do you know it from any member of the committee that they have done the same?—I do not.

21897. You have told Mr. Vizard that no attempts were made to induce persons to become subscribers; you limit it to that and not to members of the committee?—The answer was as to subscribers.

[The Witness withdrew.

William Vizard, Esq., was called in; and Examined, as follows:

W. Vizard, Esq.

21898. Mr. *Clarkson.*] YOU are the solicitor of this company?—I am joint-solicitor with my partner, Mr. Leman.

21899. Were you so from the year 1835, when it was originally contemplated?—I was so for two or three years before that, while Sir John Rennie's line was under the consideration of the present committee, and I have continued so to the present time.

21900. Did you subscribe the deed of 1835 for 75 shares?—I believe I did; I have no doubt I did.

21901. How long did you keep them after you subscribed the deed?—Some of them I kept a very few days, I think.

21902. How many of them did you part with in a very few days?—I do not recollect exactly. I took 75 shares, intending some of them for two brothers of mine. I signed for the whole number, the directors knowing nothing of the use I was to make of them, and I allowed some of them to go to two brothers, they paying me the amount of the deposit I paid.

21903. You subscribed for how many out of the 75 for your brothers?—Fifteen.

21904. For each?—No, between them.

21905. Do you mean that you parted only in a few days with those 15?—Yes; I do not mean to say I did not part with others afterwards.

21906. Do you recollect the quotation of them in the market at that time?—At what time?

21907. At the time you subscribed the deed?—I believe there was no quotation in the market. I do not believe they were at a premium when I signed the deed.

21908. After the first few days, when did you part with any of the remainder?—I do not recollect, but many months afterwards.

21909. How many?—Late in the spring or the summer of 1836.

21910. Did you do it by means of a broker?—Yes.

21911. Who was that?—I believe it was Mr. Shewell, one of your directors.

21912. That was in the spring or summer of 1836?—Yes.

21913. How many did you dispose of then?—I do not recollect.

21914. About how many?—I will tell you how many I have now, I have 30.

21915. Are they a part of your original 75?—I cannot tell.

21916. Have you speculated in them?—I have bought some, and sold some since.

21917. I want to know what have been your transactions in the shares of the company from the original signature of the deed?—I subscribed for 75 shares; I allowed my brothers to take a certain number of them, I think 15, I was solicitor to the Northern and Eastern Railway at the same time; and one of the directors having suggested to me to buy some of those shares, then at a premium, I agreed with him so to do; and, according to my recollection, his broker was

Mr.

Mr. Shewell, and I employed Mr. Shewell in that capacity as my confidential agent to sell some Brighton shares, and buy some Northern and Eastern.

21918. Who was the director of the North Eastern?—Am I bound to tell that?

21919. Yes?—Mr. Goring Thomas, then a partner in Esdaile's house. I recollect that transaction passed; and I think that Mr. Shewell was the broker employed, through Mr. Goring Thomas, to sell the one and buy the other.

21920. That, you think, was in the spring or summer of the last year?—I think it was; I do not recollect exactly.

21921. What quantity of the Brighton did you sell?—That I cannot recollect.

21922. What quantity of the North Eastern did you purchase?—I do not recollect that either.

21923. What was the state of the market?—They were both at a premium; the Brighton at a considerably higher premium than the North Eastern, which was partly the inducement for me to make the exchange.

91924. Cannot you tell me the number of shares?—No.

21925. After that transaction, when was the next transaction of either sale or purchase?—I think in the course of a week or two I bought some more Brighton.

21926. Through whose agency?—I am not sure whether at that time Mr. Shewell was employed, or whether I employed my own broker.

21927. Who is your broker?—Mr. Easthope.

21928. If it was not Mr. Shewell, it was Mr. Easthope?—Yes, or it might be my bankers.

21929. I must ask you their names?—Messrs. Coutts & Co. I am inclined to think it was not Messrs. Coutts; I know Mr. Easthope bought or sold some for me.

21930. Can you tell me what number of shares that transaction consisted of?—No, only the result; I began with 75, and I now have 30.

21931. You have the best means of telling us whether the 30 are any part of the 75, because you have heard the secretary say he can identify them?—I have no doubt, by means of the secretary, it might be traced whether the shares I hold now are the same or not. If you ask me, I should say my belief is that they are; but as I both bought and sold, the shares got mixed up together in the bundle in my box, and I took no care whether they were the one or the other.

21932. Perhaps you will take the trouble of looking at them between this and to-morrow?—I shall have no difficulty in producing the receipts.

21933. You cannot tell the Committee the extent of your dealings in sales or purchases?—I know they are very trifling.

21934. Can you give us an idea?—I can answer it thus, that I never became possessed of 75 shares again.

21935. You might deal in them very extensively without that?—I think I had two transactions; my first was that with reference to the North Eastern; I subsequently bought some more, and subsequently sold some.

21936. Was there any time you had none?—No.

21937. Was there any time you had less than 30?—No.

21938. Are you able to be positive upon that?—I have not the smallest doubt of it.

21939. If I was to ask you whether you could be certain you had not dealt in these shares to the extent of many hundreds, you could answer me?—Certainly I have not.

21940. I merely ask you for my own information, because you cannot fix upon any one number?—

Mr. *Leman* suggested whether this inquiry did not come within the rule pointed out by the Committee this morning as not having any relation to the subscription list; that he merely threw it out for the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that the inquiry had relation to the allegation in the petition that shares had been trafficked in, in the face of one of the clauses in their own deed, that no shares should be trafficked in.

The *Chairman* recommended Mr. Clarkson to limit his examination to the establishing of facts.

21941. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Were you aware of the existence of that clause in the deed prepared in your own office, in which the provisional committee declared that they would not recognise the transfer of any scrip or certificates till after the passing of the Act?—Perfectly.

W. Vizard, Esq.

6 June 1837.

21942. How do you reconcile your transactions in the market with that provision in the deed?—At the time I signed the original subscription deed I knew I had made myself liable, at all times, and under all circumstances, to the full extent to which I had subscribed the deed; and I knew also, that no act of mine could relieve me from that liability, and that I transferred those shares by handing over the certificates, as has been constantly done by all holders and proprietors, in this and every other railway company, perfectly aware that this clause in this deed was in all other deeds, and that they took it with the equitable interest that it gave them; that the directors had a right, after the Act was obtained, to adopt the assignee of the person the then holder of the shares, or the original subscribers; and if the then holder of the shares should be rejected by the company, he would have a claim upon me for reimbursement of the money.

21943. Is that the whole of the answer you have to give to that question?—Yes.

21944. Then do you, as a lawyer, consider that the subscription of that deed which made you liable to a call only to the amount of 5*l.* and no more, until the Act was obtained, did in point of fact make you liable for more, unless it was obtained?—I never had the smallest doubt that the deed made me liable to pay the whole of the 100*l.*, but limited that sum to 5*l.* till the Act was obtained; but after the Act was obtained I should have to pay 95*l.*

21945. Suppose the Act was not obtained?—Then my liability was limited to 5*l.*

21946. And then did you consider, if the Act had been obtained, that your liability would co-exist with any liability on the part of the holder of the shares?—Until the directors, acting under the Act, had registered that assignment of my shares, I had no doubt they might look to me, and I was liable to the full extent; and not only do I say that, but acting under the advice of counsel, I have given that opinion to my own clients in another railway.

21947. Do you not know that your own Bill contemplated a clause making liable the holders of the scrip?—I do not know that there is any such thing; I should say personally I have not read the Bill.

21948. How could you tell what your liabilities were when the Act passed, if you had not read it?—I am speaking of the deed.

21949. You are speaking of the liabilities after the Act passed?—I have not read this Bill; I do not know that there is anything peculiar in it, but I have no doubt that it is like the former Bill, which I have read.

21950. What does it say, as to the certificates of registered holders?—I do not know.

21951. Having read that Act, you do not know whether it contains a clause making the registered holders of certificates or scrip the persons liable for the undertaking?—Yes, I am aware of that; I remember the clause.

21952. Have the goodness to read that clause?—" And be it further enacted, that the said company shall, and they are hereby required, at their first or some subsequent general meeting, and afterwards from time to time, to cause the names of the several corporations, and the names and additions of the several persons who shall then be, or shall from time to time thereafter become entitled to shares in the said undertaking, with the number of shares which they are respectively entitled to, and the amount of the subscriptions paid thereon, and also the proper number by which every share shall be distinguished, to be fairly and distinctly entered in a book to be kept by the said company; and after such entry made, to cause their common seal to be affixed thereto; and the said company shall, from time to time, cause a certificate or ticket, with the common seal of the said company affixed thereto, to be delivered to every such proprietor on demand, specifying the share or shares to which he is entitled in the said undertaking, such proprietor paying to the said company the sum of 2*s.* 6*d.*, and no more, for every such certificate or ticket; and such certificate or ticket shall be admitted in all courts whatsoever, as *primâ facie* evidence of the title of such respective proprietors, their successors, executors, administrators or assigns, to the share or shares therein specified; but the want of such certificate or ticket shall not hinder or prevent the proprietor of any of the said shares from selling or disposing thereof; and such certificate or ticket may be in the words or to the effect following; (that is to say), 'London and Brighton Railway Company, No . These are to certify, that *A. B.*, of , is the proprietor of the share (or shares), No. ,

of

of the London and Brighton Railway Company, subject to the rules, regulations and orders of the said company.'"

21953. How do you apprehend that the company would ascertain who were the proprietors of scrip?—I apprehend the course to be pursued, under that clause, would be, that there would be an advertisement for shareholders to come in and have their shares registered; and if persons presenting the certificates came, and claimed to be shareholders, and the company adopted them, they would be registered, and, when registered, that would relieve the original subscribers; if the company chose to register the original subscribers only, they would be entitled only to put those on the register.

21954. Do you conceive, as a lawyer, that the company have the power of determining which they will adopt?—Yes, I have no doubt of it, under that clause of the Act; then comes the clause of the Act which prescribes what shall be done to entitle him to be an assignee; the Act prescribes the form in which the assignment shall be made, and provides that no person shall be admitted until the previous calls have been paid.

21955. There have been no calls?—There may be a call the day after the Act has passed.

21956. Or long after?—Yes.

21957. I wish you to tell the Committee whether you mean to say, as a lawyer, that, under the clause you have taken the trouble to read, you believe the directors had the power of rejecting any *bonâ fide* holder of their certificates?—Yes.

21958. Look at that certificate [*handing a Certificate to the Witness*] and read it?—"The holder of this certificate will be entitled to one share in the London and Brighton Railway Company, when the Act shall have been obtained."

21959. Do you mean to tell the Committee, as a lawyer, you have no doubt that the committee of directors would be entitled, under that clause, to reject the claim of any *bonâ fide* holder of those certificates?—Yes, I think so.

21960. *Chairman.*] Is that the construction of the words in the certificate, or the words of the proposed Act you refer to?—

Mr. *Clarkson.*] I put them both together.

Witness.] I have no doubt, under the deed, the original subscriber is the only person liable till the Act is obtained, and the only person having any claim; but when the Act is obtained, the Act provides how assignments shall be made, and no assignee can claim, except by an assignment made under the form and subject to the conditions prescribed by the Act.

21961. We are quite agreed upon the subject of the liability of the subscribers to the deed till the Act passes; there is no doubt of a man who subscribes the deed making himself liable till the Act passes, and if any call shall be made beyond that first call, he shall be liable up to that time. But let me read to you these preceding clauses: "And be it further enacted, that all the shares and proportions of and in the said undertaking, or the joint stock or fund of the said company, shall, to all intents and purposes, be deemed personal estate, and be transmissible as such, and shall not be deemed to be of the nature of real property." And then this clause: "And be it further enacted, that the said company shall, and they are hereby required, at their first or some subsequent general meeting, and afterwards from time to time, to cause the names of the several corporations, and the names and additions of the several persons who shall then be or who shall from time to time thereafter become entitled to shares in the said undertaking——

21962. *Chairman.*] It does not say holders?—According to the provisions of the Act, I think I understand the thing perfectly now.

21963. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you mean to say that you should not consider, under this clause of the Act, that the person who had become entitled to shares in that undertaking would be the real *bonâ fide* holder of the scrip?—I do not think he would.

21964. *Chairman.*] It does not define what is the title?—The Act does, in another part; it prescribes the form of assignment, and therefore the assignee can only claim under that assignment. It is restrained till the Act passes, by the restriction in the deed; and when the Act passes, he is restrained by the regulations in the Act.

21965. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you consider that the clause in the deed in which the provisional committee refuse to recognise any transfer of shares until the passing of the Act, was introduced for the purpose of preventing the transfer of shares

W. Vizard, Esq.

6 June 1837.

or encouraging it?—I do not know how the clause was put in, whether by my counsel or whether the deed was copied from another deed: if you ask me my opinion, I say it is in every deed.

21966. I ask you the object of it; not whether it is in every deed?—The object was, to enable the company to look to their original subscribers.

21967. Do you not believe that the object was to prevent the proprietors transferring their shares?—It was not intended to restrain the proprietors doing what they liked with their shares; but the object was to prevent the members of the provisional committee looking to any one but the parties whose liability they had originally taken.

21968. You do not think it was intended to prevent the proprietors dealing in the shares?—No; so far as they could accomplish it, the object was that the provisional committee should not be bound to look beyond them.

21969. You say it was to prevent them being bound to look beyond the original proprietors; do you believe that was the whole intention?—I believe it was.

21970. You do not believe it was intended to check the transfer of shares?—I do not know whether it operated ——

21971. That is not the question. I want to know whether it was not so intended?—I cannot tell what passed through the minds of other parties; in my own view it was to save the committee the trouble of looking anywhere beyond the original subscribers.

21972. Was it with a view of keeping the shares in the hands of those whose respectability was a guarantee to the company?—They knew they would be compelled to meet the liabilities whether they liked it or not; but the object was that the committee might know who the parties were they were to send their notices to.

21973. Am I to understand that the object of that clause was not to prevent the proprietors transferring their shares?—I do not believe it was.

21974. But you believe that the only object of it was to save the directors from the trouble of looking elsewhere than to those who originally signed the deed?—And that those parties acknowledging should not be made use of as a reason why the original subscribers should be relieved from their liability; if the directors had acquiesced in the transfer, that would have been a reason in equity why they might be relieved.

21975. And you consider that to be the only object of those words?—Yes, I dare say it operated in the other sense also.

21976. It did not operate with you in that sense?—Not to the full extent; I knew what I was about.

21977. And you have so advised; and as a lawyer you consider when this Act passed, the fact of a man being *bonâ fide* holder of scrip purchased in the market, would not necessarily and as such entitle him to require the directors to register him as the holder?—No, not until he had done what the Act requires.

21978. Done what?—Taken an assignment in the form required by the Act.

21979. Taken an assignment?—Yes.

21980. From whom?—From the original holder.

21981. You are of opinion that the holder of shares sold in the market in the ordinary way, as you sold them in the market, which is not always attended with the circumstance of knowing of whom you buy or sell, would not entitle the party to be registered as owner?—That is my opinion.

21982. And so you have advised this provisional committee?—I do not know that the question has been put to me; but I should advise them that they were not bound to put any man upon the register who did not come in with an assignment in the form given,

21983. Is not that an assignment after the passing of the Act?—I believe not.

21984. Turn to the clause?—I know that the Act applies to an assignee after the passing of the Act, but I have no doubt, under the prohibitory clause we have so often adverted to, the directors are not bound to recognize any man who takes under an assignment before the passing of the Act.

21985. Do you mean to convey to the Committee that the directors under the Act would not be bound to register a *bonâ fide* holder of shares or scrip ostensibly purchased in the market before the Act was passed?—I believe they are not.

21986. Not unless they were the original subscribers to the deed?—Yes, they are bound to register the original subscribers, but not bound to register any person

how

W. Vizard, Esq.

6 June 1837.

who takes an assignment before the passing of the Act; and when the Act comes into operation, there is a provision in the Act to regulate the assignment.

21987. Do you think that a party purchasing in the market scrip *bonâ fide*, might be by the directors under this Act driven to his action against the person of whom he purchased, to recover his money?—I should say I have no doubt of it.

21988. Then you, knowing or believing as a lawyer, that the person who purchased scrip in the market before the Act passed would be driven to his action against the party selling it, you yourself sold some shares in the market?—I sold some and bought some.

21989. Do you know who you sold to?—No.

21990. Or who you bought of?—I have no doubt I could trace both the one and the other.

21991. You can trace it by an action?—I do not know how to trace out a defendant by an action; I never heard of that before.

21992. You were fully of that opinion when you went into the market?—I do not know that I thought much about it: I have no doubt of it now, and if I had taken the same pains you have compelled me to do since I have been in this room, I should have arrived at the same conclusion I have now.

21993. That would not prevent you going into the market?—No.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Routh*, was called in; and Examined as follows:

Mr. *W. Routh*.

21994. Mr. *Clarkson*.] ARE you one of the provisional committee of this company?—Yes.

21995. Are you the holder of any shares now?—Yes.

21996. How many?—Is that a question which I ought to answer?

21997. *Chairman*.] As a member of the provisional committee, you must answer it.—Eighty shares.

21998. Mr. *Clarkson*.] Have you any other shares elsewhere you are not the holder of at present?—No.

21999. Are you in possession of all the shares you subscribed the deed for?—No.

22000. Why not?—Because I sold some of them.

22001. With the exception of those you sold, are you in possession of all the shares for which you subscribed the deed?—Yes.

22002. What proportion of the shares for which you subscribed the deed, have you sold?—I subscribed the deed for 222 shares.

22003. £.21,000?—£. 22,200.

22004. How soon after that did you sell any portion of them?—I sold 50 shares in about six weeks afterwards.

22005. In the market?—No.

22006. Where?—To my partner, Mr. Crawshay.

22007. About how soon after did you part with any more?—Not for a long time afterwards. I am not aware exactly. I was not aware you were going to ask these questions, and I am not prepared with the dates.

22008. Did you sell any in the market?—What do you mean by "in the market."

22009. Through a broker?—Yes.

22010. What was the name of the broker?—Some through Mr. Lawrence and some through Mr. Simone.

22011. Is Mr. Lawrence a broker?—Yes.

22012. Any relation to the director?—A brother.

22013. What portion of them did you sell through Mr. Lawrence?—I do not recollect.

22014. About?—I am not able to state; I really do not recollect.

22015. Could you find it out for us by to-morrow?—If he is in town, I can learn it through him.

22016. Did you sell them at a premium?—Yes.

22017. What premium?—Those through Mr. Lawrence at 12 premium.

22018. Did you sell those you sold through Mr. Lawrence before or after those you sold through Mr. Simone?—I do not recollect.

22019. Did you sell those you sold through Mr. Simone at a premium?—Yes.

22020. Can you tell us the amount of those?—No, I cannot.

Mr. *W. Routh.*

6 June 1937.

22021. Or the period?—No, I cannot.

22022. Have you purchased as well as sold?—I purchased one.

22023. Only one?—That is all until after the Bill was lost.

22024. *Chairman.*] Do you mean you made one purchase, or bought one share?—I bought one share before the Bill was lost; the governess of my children had very foolishly purchased a share at 15 premium, and I took it off her hands.

22025. What was the state of the market at that time?—I believe that was about its value; but I did not think she ought to hold it, and I took it off her hands.

22026. Did that leave you in the possession of 80 shares at that time?—I cannot recollect.

22027. Surely you can tell; it is rather an interesting subject; how many shares have you been in possession of at any one time?—222, the number I subscribed for.

22028. Never more?—Never.

22029. Were you ever in possession of less than 80?—No, I think not.

22030. You do not know it accurately?—I think I can state that positively.

22031. Have you bought or sold shares in the undertaking after the Bill was lost?—After the Bill was lost in the House of Lords, I bought several shares; I believe 50 or 60.

22032. Through whom?—I do not recollect; I think through Mr. Simone.

22033. What were they at then?—At one discount.

22034. Did you buy any others but those 50 or 60 through Mr. Simone?—No, I think not.

22035. Did you buy none through Mr. Lawrence after that?—I believe not.

22036. Is that all the transactions you have had in these shares?—Yes.

22037. Then I understand you have sold through Mr. Simone and through Mr. Lawrence, and purchased one in the manner you have described very kindly, and you have also purchased, you think, through Mr. Simone, some 50 or 60 since the Bill was lost in the Lords?—Yes.

22038. And that was all?—No, I purchased some lately.

22039. How lately?—A month ago.

22040. How many?—I believe 16; I am not sure.

22041. Through whom?—I do not know.

22042. Through a broker?—No, I believe not.

22043. Who did you purchase them of?—Mr. Crawshay told me there were 50 shares to be sold, and he asked me if I would take a third of them, and I did; but I cannot tell you the price of them.

22044. Was there any time when you had so few as 20 shares?—No.

22045. You are quite sure of that?—Yes.

22046. Are there any shares to which your name is appended, which you have not taken up?—How appended?

22047. Appended to the subscription deed?—No; what do you mean by appended?

22048. To the deed?—Certainly not.

22049. Have you paid upon any shares you have not taken up?—No.

22050. Have you paid deposits upon any shares you have not taken up?—No, certainly not.

22051. If it shall have been said you have subscribed the deed, aye and very lately too, for a certain amount of shares, I think 90, upon which you have paid deposits, but which shares you have not taken up, is that a mistake?—Yes, decidedly.

22052. Are you then the holder of shares upon which deposits have been paid, for which you have not subscribed the deed?—Yes.

22053. How long has that been the case?—I do not know; it was during the time the Bill was before Parliament last session.

22054. How comes it you have not subscribed the deed for those shares?—I did not subscribe the deed, because there were some shares of my own that I disposed of, and with the consent of my brother directors I directed Mr. Till to give me other shares to replace them, upon which I paid my deposit.

22055. I do not quite understand that; there were some shares of which you were the proprietor, and which you have sold?—Which I have disposed of.

22056. That means sold?—If you please.

22057. Sold in the market?—Yes.

22058. What

22058. What shares had you of your own at the time that arrangement was made?—I do not recollect.

22059. Had you as many as 20?—Yes, decidedly.

22060. What time of the year was it?—In April or May.

22061. Will it appear upon the Minutes as a matter directed by the provisional committee?—I am not sure of it.

22062. Were you present at the time it was discussed?—I am not sure about that.

22063. What was the amount of the shares that were discussed?—Seventy shares and 20 shares.

22064. What was the necessary amount of shares to qualify a director?—I do not know what was filled into the Bill; I think it was contemplated to fill in 10.

22065. What was the agreement about it in the deed?—I am not aware.

22066. Was there any number of shares?—I do not know indeed.

22067. Can you tell the Committee how many shares you actually held at the time you represented to your brother directors you had parted with some, and requested Mr. Till to give you others?—No.

22068. Can you give any notion?—No.

22069. How can you tell it was more than 20?—I am sure of it.

22070. It was in May last year you sold those, for which you requested a substitute?—Yes.

22071. Through whom were they sold?—Seventy were sold through Mr. Lawrence.

22072. Any through anybody else?—No.

22073. What was the state of the market in April last year?—Those shares were sold at 12 premium.

22074. In April in last year?—Yes.

22075. Did you take the shares from Mr. Till by the permission of the directors?—Yes.

22076. Ninety in number?—Seventy.

22077. And the other 20?—Afterwards.

22078. Did you pay any premium upon them?—No.

22079. You had sold the 70 shares through Mr. Lawrence at 12 premium, and upon an application to the directors, obtained permission from them to receive 70 shares, and 30 at par?—Yes.

22080. Were they not at 17¾ premium at that time?—Certainly not.

22081. I find them so quoted?—That may be.

22082. Did you explain to your brother directors you had made a profit of 12 premium?—I made no profit.

22083. They were at 12 premium?—Yes.

22084. Did you explain that to them?—I told them what they had been sold at, but they were sold through Mr. Lawrence.

22085. How many transactions in Stephenson's Brighton shares have you had through Mr. Lawrence?—I do not recollect any but that; I recollect no others; I may be wrong.

22086. You can give the Committee no notion of your general transactions in those shares?—I do not know that I can; I did not keep them in any books; I could by applying to Mr. Simone and Mr. Lawrence.

22087. Forgive my asking whether it has been profitable or otherwise?—Profitable.

22088. Have you any objection to state the amount?—I do not know.

22089. Everybody knows that Mr. Routh is a man of the world and a gentleman?—I cannot state the amount.

22090. Has it been very profitable?—No, certainly not.

22091. You have dealt in some hundreds?—No.

22092. You had but 80 left out of 222?—I understood by your term dealing, at any one time.

22093. You have dealt in hundreds altogether?—Perhaps.

22094. You say you cannot give us an idea of the extent of your transactions; about how many may you have had in buying and selling in the market of Stephenson's Brighton shares while you have been a director?—Perhaps six or seven.

22095. Not more than that?—I think not more than that.

 22096. Have

Mr. *W. Routh.*

6 June 1837.

22096. Have all your transactions, except with Mr. Crawshay, been through Mr. Simone or through Mr. Lawrence?—I think so.

22097. Were you aware that one of the provisions in the deed of the subscribers, of which you were one, was, that the directors would not recognise the transfer of any shares until the passing of the Act of Parliament?—I dare say I did read the deed at the time, but I have no recollection of any such clause in it, though there may be.

22098. If there had been such a clause, should you have considered yourself at liberty to transfer your shares to parties in the market, pending the application to Parliament?—I can see no impropriety in it.

22099. Why not, if there was a clause in it to prevent it?—I should have felt myself bound in honour to ratify it.

22100. Should you not think you were acting in the teeth of the deed, by which you had declared you would not recognise any such transfer?—Not if I meant to ratify it afterwards.

22101. What interpretation should you put upon the clause, declaring that the subscribers would not recognise the transfer of any shares until the Act passed?—I never understood that clause in any other way than that the original subscribers to the deed remained liable.

22102. The original liability and the continuance of the liability of the original subscribers would not be of any material assistance to the unhappy assignee?—But it would to the concern.

22103. How should you have proposed to remedy the inconvenience, supposing it to have followed, of the directors refusing to have recognised your transfer of your shares to another, in the event of their refusing to do so?—I should have considered, upon such an event happening, I was liable to stand in the same shoes I originally did.

22104. You would have considered yourself bound to put the party in the same situation?—Yes, if the directors refused.

22105. How would you have done it, if you did not know who it was?—He would know.

22106. You do not know who you bought of, how could you set him right?—That is a question more proper for a lawyer than for me.

22107. Forgive me for asking, were you a subscriber to the Birmingham and Derby?—Yes.

22108. For 10,000*l.*?—Yes.

22109. And the North Midland, 5,000*l.*?—Yes.

22110. The York and North Midland, 7,500*l.*?—Yes.

22111. And the London and Cambridge, 20,000*l.*?—Yes.

22112. Another subscription to the London and Cambridge for 20,000*l.* more, making 40,000*l.* in the whole?—No, 10,000*l.*

22113. £. 10,000, you say?—Yes.

22114. That made 30,000*l.*?—Yes.

22115. And the Brighton, 22,000*l.*?—Yes.

22116. Making, in the whole, 84,700*l.*?—Yes.

22117. Be so good as to allow me to ask you, whether you were a director, or a provisional committee gentleman, upon any one of these railways?—No, none, except the Brighton.

22118. What proportion of the shares of these several companies do you now hold with reference to the amount you took?—I hold 50 shares in the York and North Midland.

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question.

22119. Mr. *Clarkson.*] How many of those several companies have obtained Acts, if any?—I believe, all you have mentioned.

22120. Now I propose to ask you how many of those several companies, that have obtained their Acts, have you registered shares in?—In all.

22121. To what extent?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question, as not coming within the scope of the inquiry as to the subscription deed.

Mr. *Clarkson* was heard in support of the question.

The *Committee* decided that Mr. Clarkson might ask whether the Witness had refused to register his shares.

22122. Mr.

22122. Mr. *Clarkson.*] For how many shares did you subscribe in the Birmingham and Derby?—One hundred shares.

22123. How many of those have you registered for?—Fifty.

22124. The North Midland?—Fifty.

22125. How many have you registered?—Fifty.

22126. You think the whole?—Yes.

22127. The York and North Midland?—One hundred.

22128. How many registered?—Thirty.

22129. The London and Cambridge, how many did you subscribe for?—Three hundred.

22130. And registered?—Twenty.

22131. Then it was 100 in each of the others?—Yes.

22132. And 300 in the London and Cambridge?—Yes.

The *Chairman* suggested, that the Witness should be asked whether he had been applied to, and refused to register.

22133. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Were the remaining shares you have not registered, shares you have sold in the market?—No.

22134. What has become of them?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question, of what Mr. Routh had done with his shares in other companies.

The *Chairman* stated, that if similar inquiries were made of the proceedings of other persons, not so respectable as Mr. Routh, the Committee could not draw a distinction; that if the inquiry was made in the one case, it ought to be in the other.

22135. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you been applied to at all to register the remaining shares in these companies?—No, I have not.

22136. I dare say they would be glad to have you, but you have not the shares, nevertheless?—Yes, I have some of them.

22137. You have the shares, but have not registered them?—Yes.

22138. How many more have you in the Birmingham and Derby?—None.

22139. The North Midland, how many have you?—None.

22140. The York and North Midland?—None.

22141. The London and Cambridge?—I have 50 in that.

22142. Have you dealt with any of the shares of these companies in the market?—No.

22143. Or by means of a broker?—Yes.

22144. That is what I mean, through your market-gardener; you have dealt with all of them in that way?—Yes, I think so.

22145. You could not tell me the state of the account in the Brighton?—No.

22146. What is the state of the account in the others; it rather looks up?—No, I think not.

22147. You have sold at a premium?—Yes, I have sold at a premium.

22148. And purchased at a discount?—No.

22149. None?—No.

22150. A smaller premium?—I believe not.

22151. In those that have been the subject matter of speculation in the market, you have made profit upon them?—Yes, some.

22152. Generally speaking?—Yes.

22153. Why did you sell those shares; were they sold for the purpose of making a profit in the then state of the market?—In some cases, from a doubt as to obtaining the bills.

22154. And in others, because the market was looking pleasant for a sale?—I chose to sell them.

22155. I do not mean any disrespect to you, but it was profitable?—Yes, sometimes.

22156. That was the inducement?—There might have been other inducements, and there frequently were.

22157. That formed a part?—Yes.

Mr. *W. Routh.*

6 June 1837.

22158. *Chairman.*] In the London and Cambridge, in which you have sold none, you were a subscriber for 300, and have sold none?—No.

22159. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You have registered 20 and hold 50?—Yes.

22160. In all these companies where you hold less than you originally subscribed for, is it in consequence of having sold your interest in them?—In some cases.

22161. Why have you not registered the other 50 in the London and Cambridge?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question.

Witness.] I wish to answer it.

22161*. *Chairman.*] You originally subscribed for 300; you registered 20, and you believe you have 50 more?—Yes.

22162. Are those part of the original 300?—Yes, and the question is, why I did not register them ——

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the question.

Mr. *Clarkson* waived the question.

22163. Have you been applied to by the company to register?—No.

22164. Have you paid all the deposits upon them?—No, only upon 100.

22165. Mr. *Clarkson.*] In the London and Cambridge?—Yes.

22166. Have you paid all the deposits upon the other three sets?—Yes.

22167. *Chairman.*] Have you paid the subsequent calls upon all the shares, including the 50 that you hold?—Yes.

22168. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have the kindness to tell us whether the two fifties and the 30 you speak of as having registered in the Birmingham and North Midland, and the York and North Midland, are the fifties and 30 of the original shares purchased?—The original shares.

22169. You have not bought and sold in those companies?—No.

22170. Be so good as to tell us whether, in the sales in the London and Cambridge, do you mean 50 besides the 20?—Yes.

22171. Can you tell us the amount you sold?—I only sold 30.

22172. What became of the 200?—I never took them.

22173. You subscribed the deed for them?—Yes.

22174. Paid the deposit for them?—No.

22175. And never took the shares?—No.

22176. You did not like the look of the thing. Did you subscribe the deed for the whole amount of the other three?—Yes.

22177. And took them all?—Yes.

22178. Have you sold others?—Yes.

22179–80. With reference to the periods at which the Act was obtained by the Birmingham and Derby, when was it you sold the 50 shares in the Birmingham and Derby; how soon after the Act passed?—

The *Chairman* stated, that Mr. Clarkson could not go into all the transactions in detail with respect to each of these companies.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, he wanted to learn how soon after or before the Acts were obtained it was the witness had parted with a portion of the shares for which he had subscribed.

Witness.] To the best of my recollection, the 50 Birmingham and Derby shares I parted with, I let my partner, Mr. Crawshay, have, without any premium at all.

22181. At what time?—Within a day or two after signing the deed.

22182. Before the Act passed?—Yes.

22183. Perhaps you signed the deed for him?—No.

22184. Do you know what shares Mr. Crawshay had of his own at that time?—He had none at that time.

22185. The Birmingham and Derby?—None.

22186. Mr. Crawshay seems to have subscribed it?—That is William Crawshay; I am speaking of George Crawshay.

22187. In

22187. In the north of England, were they sold in the market or to Mr. Crawshay?—They were sold in the market.

22188. Can you tell us how near to the period of the passing of the Act?—No.

22189. You sold them at a premium?—Yes.

22190. And also the York and North Midland?—The York and North Midland I allowed a friend of mine, Mr. Murray, to have.

22191. Not at any premium?—Yes, I think it was at a small premium.

22192. *Chairman.*] Was there any previous understanding in the case of the Cambridge, that you should not take up all the shares?—There was an understanding that the explanation that Mr. Vizard gave me should be satisfactory.

Mr. *Vizard* objected to the answer, as being irrelevant to this inquiry, and he also objected to the transactions of another company being gone into.

The *Chairman* stated, it was in justification of the witness's conduct that he put the question.

Mr. *Clarkson* requested that Mr. Routh should furnish the Committee with the dates of the various sales and purchases of shares in which he had been engaged.

The *Chairman* stated, that the fact had been already established.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22193. There are a certain number of shares which you hold for which you have not signed the deed; has the deed been brought to you for signature?—No.

22194. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Was it with the consent of the directors you did not sign the deed at the time you had these 90 shares?—I do not recollect that.

22195. Was not it a part of the stipulation, that you should have the shares without signing the deed, or of course you would have signed it as part of your duty?—I do not recollect that.

22196. Was not it with their perfect knowledge you had not signed it?—I do not know that.

22197. Was not it with the perfect knowledge of Mr. Till you had not signed it?—Yes, no doubt of it.

22198. Was the deed in the habit of being on the table when the directors met?—No.

22199. Or being called for?—No.

22200. Mr. *Vizard.*] Is not the deed kept locked up in the strong box at the banker's?—I have not seen it since I signed it, 12 months ago.

22201. Is there not a direction that the deed shall be kept locked up in the strong box at the banker's?—I should think that very proper.

22202. Has the secretary ever applied to you to sign the deed?—No.

22203. Has it been by any direction of your own he has not applied to you?—Certainly not.

22204. May I ask you whether you do not consider yourself fully competent for all the shares you have subscribed, whether in this company or any other?—Perfectly so.

22205. Can the sales of shares be traced in the broker's book?—I do not know

22206. *Chairman.*] You are an iron-master?—Yes.

22207. Which connects you very much in interest with the progress of railways?—Very much.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mercurii, 7° die Junii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Brotherton.	Mr. C. Lushington.
Mr. Forster.	Mr. Thornely.
Mr. D. Gaskell.	Mr. Warburton.

HENRY WARBURTON, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *William Routh*, was called in; and further Examined as follows:

Mr. *W. Routh.*

7 June 1837.

22208. Mr. *Clarkson.*] HAVE you been able to procure for us the dates of the transactions to which your evidence referred yesterday, and the several amounts of them?—No, I am not able to do it.

22209. You have examined your papers for that purpose, and you do not find that they afford you the means of doing it?—I have looked at some papers, and I do not find that they do.

22210. Give me leave to ask you: I enumerated a certain number of adventures in the shape of railroads, to which I called your attention yesterday; was there any other to which you were a subscriber?—Yes, I subscribed to the Blackwall, which you did not mention.

22211. Mr. *Thornely.*] In the case of wealthy and respectable gentlemen becoming subscribers to those railways, are you aware of any custom by which they shall not, or is there any understanding by which they shall not take up the shares after the passing of the Act?—No, I am not aware of any such custom.

22212. Of course, you consider they are liable to do so if called upon by the company?—Yes.

22213. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Wherever it turns out that an individual of the character the honourable Member represents declines to register, or has not in fact registered all the shares for which he has originally subscribed, it is the act of his individual discretion, and not in consequence of any arrangement with the company?—Yes, so I understand.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid*, was called in; and Examined as follows:

Mr. *I. L. Goldsmid.*

22214. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Were you one of the original promoters of a scheme for a railway to Brighton called Stephenson's Line?—I cannot say I was one of the original promoters, because I did not begin quite so early as some others, but very early.

22215. When did you become connected with the company first?—I think in 1827 or 1828; my attention was called to it I know in 1829, in consequence of my having property at Brighton.

22216. Did you subscribe the deed of that company in the year 1835 or 1836?—Yes, in the year 1835, I think it was; I think it was in September 1835; I think it was about the 26th of September 1835; I took down the date.

22217. For what number of shares, in the first instance, did you subscribe?—I was going out of town, and I took for myself and friends 2,000 shares. I beg leave, in the first instance, to state, I have no concern, directly or indirectly, in any other company whatever, either as a director or shareholder in any railway company whatever. It may save you some trouble in telling you, that I took originally 2,000 shares; I submitted a list of the names of persons to the extent of 610 shares out of the 2,000 shares, so that the directors should adopt those names in lieu of mine.

22218. Was that before the deed was subscribed?—Yes, before I signed the deed.

22219. You

22219. You yourself signed the deed originally for 2,000 shares?—No; I applied in the first instance for 1,600 shares, I then applied for 400 more, making altogether 2,000 shares; out of the 2,000 shares I submitted names, to the persons who had the distribution of those shares, for 610, so that that reduced my number to 1,390.

22220. Then you did not subscribe the deed yourself for more than 1,390?—I subscribed the deed to that extent, because among the 1,390 there were some persons' names I did not consider sufficiently responsible to stand between the company and myself, and therefore I gave my name to protect the company to the extent of 1,390, and those names were included in the 1,390.

22221. Were the company aware, before you subscribed the deed, that 610 of the shares, for which you were applicant, were for other persons, and that of the 1,390 constituting the remainder you were subscribing for, some were for persons who were to be the holders of those shares whom you did not consider as good security as yourself?—Those I subscribed the deed for were persons of a perfectly responsible condition, quite as much as myself; and for the 1,390 I considered I was responsible, and I consider I am responsible up to this hour, and till the Act passes; till I am relieved according to the original engagement I entered into; and to that extent am I now bound. And whatever I may have done with these shares, and I shall be quite at your service to tell you what I have done with them, I consider I am responsible; for the 1,390 shares; you understand me, I hope?

22222. Quite. Now, be so good as to tell me what proportion of that 1,390 shares you subscribed for the reason last given?—To the extent,—I do not know that I am bound to answer it,—but I should say to the extent of 200 or 300 shares, having 1,200 shares belonging to myself; I have answered you what I think is a little inquisitorial mode of proceeding, to endeavour to ascertain that I hold myself out to the public as a subscriber for what I have put my name to; what I have disposed of internally is a little inquisitorial to inquire into.

22223. I prosecute the inquiry with that feeling; I do not want to know the names of the gentlemen who formed the subject of your last consideration, but as to the 1,200 shares, will you be so good as to inform us how long you held those 1,200?—I cannot tell you exactly how long I held 549, because I sold them in small portions during the early part of the year 1836.

22224. Do you mean to the extent of 549?—Yes.

22225. Then, 549 of those shares were disposed of in small portions in the early part of 1836?—No, not in the early part of the year; I should say the latter part of the year 1836; it may have been from July to December.

22226. Was it after the resolution of the House of Lords not to proceed further with the Bill in that session?—I should think I sold some before, but some afterwards.

22227. Have you any means of acquiring a knowledge of the dates of those transactions?—I dare say I have; but perhaps you will allow me to finish the whole disposition: then, I perceive, on the 28th of April 1837, which was the day Mr. Stephenson's Bill was thrown out in the Committee of the House of Commons, I had 651 shares, never having parted with them prior to that period. I was the proprietor of 651 of Stephenson's shares at the 28th of April of this year.

22228. The others were 590?—No, 549. Except those 651, I cannot be very accurate to a share or two, more or less; the 651 I had as late as the morning the Committee came to the decision of giving a preference to Rennie's Line; they had never been out of my possession.

22229. Of how many shares are you now the proprietor in this company?—On that very day I sold 380 at two discount, at least my broker sold them for me.

22230. How soon after the resolution of the House of Commons?—The same day.

22231. How soon after in point of time; within an hour?—I do not know; I gave an order to the broker to sell them; I did not go out of my office.

22232. Might it have been within an hour?—I should rather think it was; but I will not be very accurate upon that point; I have a responsible broker and I desired him to sell them; and in two or three hours afterwards he sent me a broker's note for them.

22233. Have you got that with you?—No.

 22234. What

Mr. *I. L. Goldsmid.*

7 June 1837.

22234. What was the name of that broker?—I have no objection to tell, if you have any curiosity, but still I do not think I have any right to answer it; I have two brokers: I hardly know whether I am right in answering the question.

22235. We will not trouble you, though we are quite entitled to it according to the practice of the Committee?—Are you? Mr. Vigne sold for me 300.

22236. At what time in the course of the day did you receive the broker's note of the sale?—I cannot tell you that.

22237. Was it in the forenoon?—Yes; I left the city at four o'clock.

22238. Were you in attendance upon the Committee in the House of Commons on that day?—Not the slightest; I preserved a perfect neutrality, and kept away.

22239. Can you tell us how soon, in the course of the day, you received information that the Committee had voted that Stephenson's Line was not further to be considered?—I mean to say distinctly, I had not received any information whatever.

22240. You sold the 300 and odd shares without any knowledge at the time of the decision of the Committee?—Yes, from my own impression that Stephenson's Line would on that very day be thrown out; that the Committee would decide against it, from the different views the Committee took of the question: I had no information at all.

22241. You sold the 300 and odd shares from no knowledge of the fact that the Committee had come to that resolution, but from your own judgment, formed from what you had observed, that Stephenson's Line would be thrown out?—Yes; I cannot say what led me to that decision; it was the workings of my own mind; what I tell you is the fact; I had no information upon the subject.

22242. I asked you how many shares you were the proprietor of at present?—Two hundred and seventy-one shares; I have never bought a single share, and therefore they are all original shares.

22243. Now as to the shares you disposed of in the latter part of 1836, from July to December, are you able to tell us in what proportions they were sold?—Not at all.

22244. Or what the state of the market was?—No, they were sold at various prices.

22245. You probably recollect the state of the market from July to December 1836; were they, upon the whole, sold at a profit?—Decidedly.

22246. Can you give us any notion of the gross profit?—As an average, perhaps at 7*l.* or 8*l.* a share; no, I should think about 6*l* a share; I will not be very accurate, but somewhere thereabout.

22247. Mr. *Vizard.*] Would that be the average?—I should think it was 6*l.* or 7*l.* a share.

22248. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You never parted with any of those remaining 271?—No, I never parted with any of the 651 before that day.

22249. Did the shares become worse in the market after the House of Commons had come to that resolution?—I sold them at two discount, they may have come down to three discount.

22250. My question was, whether the market had not become worse?—I believe they have been down to 3 or 4, and there is only 5*l.* paid; they could not have been much lower.

22251. They have been as bad as they could be?—The instalment was 5*l.*, and they have been as low as 1*l.*, at a discount of 4*l*; I sold them at 2*l.* discount; I believe I sold 80 of them at one and three quarters, and the others I sold at two discount.

22252. Have you any knowledge to whom those shares were sold?—Since I have been in the room, Mr. Crawshay told me he bought 200 of them; I have heard that in the room.

22253. But in the ordinary transactions of sales by a broker in the market, has the vendor any necessary knowledge of the party to whom the thing is sold?—He has a necessary knowledge to whom they are sold, but they are frequently sold to another broker.

22254. And that broker purchases for a principal?—Yes; and it was not till I came into the room, that Mr. Crawshay told me he bought 200; he said I might mention it, or I should not have taken the liberty.

22255. My

22255. My question was, whether the effect of a sale and purchase through a broker in the market does not leave the seller in ignorance for whom his shares are bought through the instrumentality of the other?—Yes.

22256. So that, when the director of a company, or other person interested in its concerns, sells a parcel of shares in the public market through a broker, whether they shall get into the hands of a responsible or irresponsible person the seller neither knows or inquires?—Always keep this in mind: although I parted with those pieces of paper, I am responsible for 1,390 shares.

22257. That is a question of law?—I do not know the question of law, but I have put my name to the deed, by which I am bound till the directors allow me to retire; and though I may regret the difficulty of settling the differences between us, be the consequences what they may, I am bound by it.

22258. Have the goodness to tell the Committee how you contemplate that a party purchasing in the market is to be protected, in the event of the directors refusing to register the shares of which the party shall be the holder, when you, for instance, who are the person that sells, actually do not know who that party is; as between you and the company I quite understand, if your law is correct, that the company are no losers; I quite understand your feeling of honour, and no doubt your conviction of your liability as co-existing with that deed, until, in point of fact, your name is removed from that deed by the directors?—Yes, according to the Act, if it shall pass.

22259. But, as you do not know the person to whom the shares are distributed, and as that person the directors may refuse for some reason to register, how do you propose to indemnify that person?—I suppose the Act will provide that they should transfer the shares according to the law laid down by the Act; I shall send in my name.

22260. This is a transaction before the passing of the Act?—Up to the passing of the Act I am responsible.

22261. As between you and the company; but how is the person who has purchased the shares to be indemnified; suppose the company refuse to register him?—He takes that piece of paper as a security for the money he has paid.

22262. Do you consider that the holder of the scrip you have sold is entitled to be registered?—I think he is, provided it is consistent with the Act after it has passed.

22263. Either the party who holds the shares is, in point of fact, entitled to register them when the Act has passed, or the directors have the power of refusing if they think fit?—I cannot conceive what they would do; I only know what is binding on me.

22264. How do you contemplate protection to any party to whom you may have transferred shares before the Act passing, in the event of the directors refusing to register him?—My law is very limited, and it will not enable me to answer your question.

22265. Have you read the subscribers' deed?—No.

22266. Nor the Parliamentary contract?—No; I have signed my name to it.

22267. You are tolerably conversant with the conditions of deeds of this kind?—Yes; and I will tell you what the clause is, that no person is allowed to transfer his shares before he has paid up all the calls previously made.

22268. That is your understanding of the conditions of these deeds?—Yes, that is the general understanding in the city of London.

22269. But, in the instance of the present company, there being but one call, and there being a provision in the deed that there shall be no other call till the Act has passed, as soon as that call is paid, you have a right to transfer the shares?—Yes, I conceive I have, and that I have a right to send in the names to have the shares transferred.

22270. My question is, applying itself to your proceedings before the Act, you are the holder of 100 shares; the Act has not passed; you are desirous of disposing of them; you have paid a call of 5 *l.* a share, which you are alone liable to do; you then hold yourself entitled before the Act passes to transfer those shares?—Certainly not; decidedly not.

22271. Then why did you transfer the shares in 1836 before the Act passed?—I do not know; I sold those vouchers to the parties who purchased them through my broker.

22272. You make a distinction between the vouchers and the shares?—Yes, my

Mr. I L. Goldsmid.

7 June 1837.

my distinction is this: I have got a piece of paper, representing I hold so many shares; I put them in the hands of my broker; he finds A., B. or C., who takes them from me, he knowing at that time I am responsible for the amount. Supposing the directors have the power of calling for a further sum of money, they would only look to me, and his loss would be confined to the sum he paid me.

22273. If you consider that any proprietor or subscriber has a right to transfer his shares, between the period of subscribing the deed and obtaining the Act, do you consider he is entitled to transfer the scrip?—Yes, because it does not create in the person purchasing a greater responsibility than the amount of the money paid; he may take these pieces of paper and throw them into the fire, and I stand in the gap before him; I am responsible; A., B. or C. gets hold of them; nobody can find out who he is; I am the person putting my name to the deed, and I am bound.

22274. Suppose, instead of throwing them behind the fire, he keeps them, and then goes to the directors after the Act is passed, and with the scrip in his hand claims to be registered, is he not entitled to be registered?—Yes, if the conditions of the Act allow it.

22275. Did you contemplate registering for 1,390 shares?—There you ask the workings of my mind; according to my present impression, I did not.

22276. Did you contemplate registering for anything like that large proportion?—Certainly, I have taken a large interest; the differences that exist between me and the directors induced me to part with a great many of them.

22277. The fact of your parting with them, was influenced by your differences with the directors?—Yes; but you will allow that 650 shares is not a contemptible interest in any concern.

22278. I cannot conceive anything contemptible that belongs to you?—You are pleased to be complimentary.

22279. But there is a very material difference between that amount and the number you took originally; do you mean to say that it is the understanding in the city that the party to whom the scrip is transferred is not entitled to become a shareholder for the amount of the scrip?—I mean to say this, that they cannot bind him to pay up a larger sum of money than he has advanced.

22280. If he refuses to register, they cannot make him?—No.

22281. I want to know whether your notion of the subject in the city is this: that a man being a *bonâ fide* holder, and desirous to register, the company, of which he is a proprietor, have a right to refuse him?—No; I do not think, according to my view of the Acts passed upon these subjects, that the Act would give authority to the directors to refuse; but you must know better than me whether the Act gives the company the power to refuse him.

22282. Then upon that supposition, in your mind entirely *bonâ fide* no doubt, that the purchaser of scrip in the market would, when the Act passed, if he continued to be the holder, be entitled to be registered as such, was it that you sold such of the shares as you did sell?—When I sold the shares, I conceived they had a justifiable claim to be registered.

22283. I want to know the notion upon which you proceeded?—I think, suppose you had purchased those shares of my broker, and you held them, and went to the directors, and presented yourself to ask for a transfer of those shares in your name, I should think, according to the usual mode, you would be entitled to call upon the directors to transfer the shares; but bear this in mind, I should conceive the moment the Act passed, the directors had a right immediately to have made a call for the purposes of the company, and insisting upon it.

22284. Then is it your opinion, however it may serve you or the company, to have the honour of your name attached to them, do you consider, in the event of a call upon shares, some of which have not been registered, if you had been a subscriber for those shares that did not happen to have been registered, you would have been responsible to the extent of the calls?—That depends upon whether there was a clause in the Act to that effect; I should not conceive I was.

Mr. *Vizard* submitted that these were questions of law upon the construction of the deed.

The *Chairman* stated that the questions now put were similar to those that had been put yesterday; but perhaps the learned counsel would not press the inquiry any further.

Mr. *Clarkson* was heard in support of his examination, and stated he was

was not asking the witness his opinion upon points of law, except so far as it was supported by the practice in the city, and in connexion with the steps the witness had taken. Mr. *I. L. Goldsmid.* 7 June 1837.

Witness.] It is the usual clause where there is no Act, that whenever a call is made, no person shall transfer his shares till he has paid the call made; what would be the law if the Act passed I do not know, and therefore I cannot say that.

22285. But you know very well under what impression it was you parted with those shares you parted with in the market?—I conceive that the person who held them would be entitled to call upon the directors to transfer the shares, but that the directors would have had no claim upon him; they would have looked to me, till the Act passed, for all the consequences.

22286. I have understood from you that the transferee of any shares of yours would not be compellable by means of that transfer to register for those shares?—No, but he would be entitled to do so.

22287. Was it with that impression you sold those shares?—Yes, I meant all after the Act passed.

22288. But if you admit the person to whom the shares are sold must be unknown to the seller, how are the public to be protected against these shares getting into improper hands?—The Act will take care to do justice between the public and the shareholders.

22289. That is the only explanation you can give me?—Yes.

22290. Supposing that those shares which you sell in the market, are the subject of resale and retransfer over and over again, until at length they get into the hands of an insolvent party, do you consider that the directors would be liable to register the owners of those shares, insolvent or otherwise?—If A. applies to have his shares registered, and the directors tell him at the time, "You are to pay 5 *l.* a share," I ask you, can you answer that question?

22291. Suppose they do not tell him so?—It is in the power of the directors to do so.

22292. Many a man can pay 5 *l.* a share, who cannot pay the remainder?—Very true.

22293. I want to know from you how the directors are in any respect protected against those shares getting into such hands as have been the subject matter of observation and remonstrance in this Committee from time to time; between the time of subscribing the deed and the passing of the Act of Parliament?—Till Parliament steps in and determines what proportion of responsibility shall rest upon the subscriber, or upon the person who bought the shares, I am responsible.

22294. To the company; but how is the public to be protected?—Parliament will protect the public; I bind myself, till there is a Legislative decision, to the parties who go before Parliament.

22295. Let us put this proposition: suppose the Act of Parliament for Stephenson's Line should be passed to-morrow, for how many shares do you hold yourself responsible, there being no call till they are registered?—1,390.

22296. Suppose the Act was passed to-morrow, and the whole of your 1,390 were registered, for how many shares do you consider yourself responsible?—I am responsible for 1,390 shares; and the next step would be, Mr. A. B., who holds those vouchers, would ask me to send him a ticket to sign the transfer book, and to transfer them into A. B.'s name; till that is done I stand as I did originally.

22297. I understand that perfectly?—Then it is my obtuseness, perhaps.

22298. No, it is more likely mine; I want to know, in the event of all being registered?—I only hold 271.

22299. Do you consider the directors are entitled to dispute the transfer?—I apprehend not, unless there is a clause in the Act upon the subject.

22300. Mr. *Thornely.*] You were a director of the company?—Yes, for a certain time.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22301. When you originally subscribed for the 2,000 shares, you paid the call upon the whole of those shares?—Yes; on the 28th of September 1835 I paid 10,000 *l.*

22302. As a deposit?—Yes.

Mr. *I. L. Goldsmid.*

7 June 1837.

22303. When did you cease to be a member of the provisional committee?—Some time in 1836.

22304. Was it in November last?—Mr. Till can mention the date.

Mr. *Till.*] The 21st of November 1836.

22305. Mr. *Vizard.*] You say you sold some of your shares before you ceased to be a director?—Yes.

22306. Were the other directors apprised of your having so sold them?—No, certainly not; I never told anybody of it till to-day.

22307. Or of any of these sales?—I never told any person whatever till to-day.

22308. In signing for 1,390, you say you signed for some persons not responsible; do you mean that they were minors, or persons who could not make themselves responsible?—I mean, supposing it was 20 shares or 50 shares, I did not think that they were persons that the directors might like to take as responsible persons.

22309. Did the directors know anything of it?—No, certainly not; they only knew me.

22310. Are you quite confident, when you directed the sale of the last shares, it was done before you had any knowledge that the Committee had come to a decision in favour of Rennie's Line in preference to Stephenson's?—I did not know it till after I got out of the city, that they had actually come to a decision, and my direction was given long before that; I had given Mr. Ligne the order three or four hours before that.

22311. You did not know of the decision of the Committee till after you left the city, and you gave the direction and they had been sold before you left the city?—Certainly.

22312. If there is anything you wish to have explained and put upon the minutes, if you will point it out to me, I will put the question?—Nothing more than simply this: I should like distinctly to state, that the ground upon which I took an interest in this company, was in consequence of my having property in Brighton, and endeavouring to benefit that property; it was alone with that view I took the shares.

22313. And you have never taken any part in any other company, neither as director or subscriber, or in any other way?—No, I have no concern, directly or indirectly, in any other railway company, and my sole object here was in consequence of having landed property in the county, and I thought it would benefit that property by having a railway connected with it.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *William Crawshay*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *W. Crawshay.*

22314. Mr. *Alexander.*] WERE you a director of Stephenson's Company?—I am now, and have been since February last year.

22315. For how many shares have you signed the deed?—Fifty and 50.

22316. A hundred in all?—Yes.

22317. At what time did you subscribe the deed?—The first 50 was when the shares were first given out, and I complained to my partner, Mr. Routh, who was a director, I had not sufficient allotted to me; that I wished to have more; and upon my remonstrance, I had 50 more given me.

22318. When did you sign for the last 50?—I cannot tell.

22319. Was it long after the first?—No.

22320. On both occasions you signed before the application to Parliament in 1836?—Yes.

22321. Have you been at any time the holder of more than 100?—I have bought many since.

22322. And sold some?—A few; and I purchased 50 from my partner, Mr. Routh, at the period they were about three and a half or four premium.

22323. Do you recollect the time of the year, and what year?—It was in 1836.

22324. Was it during the progress of the Bill in Parliament, or before it was brought in?—I should think it was while in progress; and I bought shares of sundry other persons whom I do not know, being bought in the market; I bought 460, making 510 in the whole, before I was a director.

22325. Since

22325. Since you have been a director, have you added to your purchases?—Yes, I bought 180.

22326. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Would not that make 560?—No, 510.

22327. Mr. *Alexander.*] That is in addition to the 100 for which your name stands subscribed to the deed?—Fifty and 50, I am a subscriber for; 50 I purchased of Mr. Routh, and 360 of other persons, making 510.

22328. Then the 510 includes the 100 for which your name is subscribed?—Yes.

22329. Since that have you purchased others?—Yes.

22330. What is the largest number you were the holder of at any time?—The largest at any time was 784, but I can explain that to you; that number was made up by the purchase of 60, which I bought in conjunction with four other persons; 15 only were mine, and I transferred 45 of them, leaving 739 shares in my own name, and now my own at this moment.

22331. Were those three speculators with yourself subscribers to the deed?—I do not know; I imagine one is: no, he is not.

22332. Have you any objection to mention who they are?—As they are not my own, I do not see the necessity for it; but one must be a subscriber.

22333. Have you any objection to mention his name?—Robert Moser.

22334. Do you know to what extent he is a subscriber; he appears to have subscribed to the extent of 6,000*l.*; Robert Moser, of Upper Thames-street: is he a partner of yours?—Yes.

22335. Seven hundred and thirty-nine was the largest number you have been proprietor of?—Yes.

22336. How many do you hold of them?—All of them.

22337. When did you purchase the last lot?—About a fortnight or three weeks since.

22338. How many were in that last lot?—Sixty.

22339. What did you purchase just before that?—Thirty-four.

22340. Was there any large quantity purchased between that 34 and the 310 you have given us?—Yes, one purchase of 180.

22341. When was that?—It was a month since; I believe they were purchased of Mr. Goldsmid; it was through a broker, and they were all new ones.

22342. You mentioned them to him this morning?—Yes.

22343. Have you any means of knowing they were his?—No.

22344. There is no name written on them?—None officially; they have been written on since if there are any.

22345. There is none there officially?—No.

22346. Your name is attached to the deed for 100, but you hold 739?—Yes.

22347. Some of them purchased in the market of persons you do not know; some of them purchased jointly with others, and others purchased of your partner, Mr. Routh?—Yes.

22348. Are you a subscriber to the Birmingham and Derby?—Two hundred shares.

22349. To the amount of 20,000*l.*?—Yes.

22350. And the North Midland Company?—One hundred shares.

22351. Is the liability 20,000*l.*?—It must be 200 then.

22352. I believe it to be 20,000*l.*?—Then it is 200 shares; I will tell you why I have forgotten the number.

22353. It is for 20,000*l.*?—Then it is 200 shares.

22354. The London and Cambridge?—Two hundred.

22355. Also 20,000*l.*?—Yes.

22356. And the Brighton 10,000*l.*?—Yes.

22357. All those Bills, with the exception of the Brighton, have become Acts?—Yes, they have.

22358. Will you tell me how many you have registered in the Birmingham and Derby, in pursuance of the Act?—Four hundred I have registered.

22359. You have a larger number than you signed for?—I paid 1*l.* per share in exchange for converting the North Midland into the Birmingham and Derby; the Act for the one at that time being got, and the Act for the other not being got.

22360. Did you effect this by purchase?—By exchanging one scrip for another, with 20*s.* each share.

Mr. *W. Crawshay.*

7 June 1837.

22361. In the Birmingham and Derby you are the holder of 400 shares?—Yes.

22362. Are they all registered?—Yes.

22363. In the North Midland you have not registered any?—No, I exchanged before the Act was obtained, fearful the Act might not be got.

22364. The Act is obtained, but you have no shares registered in it?—No.

22365. How many have you registered in the London and Cambridge?—Not any.

22366. You were a subscriber for 200 shares?—Yes, under the conviction or expectation that the line was to be made from London to Cambridge, with probably a branch to Norwich.

Mr. *Vizard* objected to this evidence, it being in relation to the transactions of another company, which were not matters for inquiry before the Committee, except so far as they related to the responsibility of the Witness.

Mr. *Alexander* was heard in support of the admissibility of the evidence.

Witness.] I have not registered in the London and Cambridge.

22367. Mr. *Thornely.*] Do you wish to assign any reason?—I am quite ready to assign the reason; I did wish to assign the reason; it appears I have embarked in the thing without meaning to carry it out; I embarked in it, intending to invest a certain sum of money in railroads, and that among others.

22368. Mr. *Alexander.*] At all events you signed for 200 shares, and you did not register any in it?—No.

22369. Were you possessed at any time of more than that 200 in the London and Cambridge?—No.

22370. Do you hold any of those, though you have not registered them?—No, not one.

22371. When did you dispose of them?—The moment I heard of the extension of the line.

22372. Can you tell me with relation to the passing of the Act?—It must have been before the passing of the Act; I cannot charge my memory with it positively, but I believe it was.

22373. You sold them before the passing of that Act?—Yes.

22374. Do you consider yourself liable to the calls upon those shares?—I do not; I hope the shares are registered in other persons' names.

22375. Have you any means of compelling the register of those shares?—None whatever.

22376. Are you totally ignorant of the transferees?—Yes, quite; they were sold in the market by my broker.

22377. You consider yourself released from all liability attaching to the signing of the deed?—Except the original deposit.

22378. That was paid?—Yes.

22379. No claim will be made upon you for that?—No, that is impossible, because I paid it myself.

22380. You disposed of those shares before the Act passed?—I think I did.

22381. Then you consider yourself released from all liability attaching to your signature?—I thought so.

22382. Are you a director in any other company?—I am a director in the Midland Counties, but I have never acted or sat.

22383. Are the Midland Counties and the Brighton the only companies in which you are a director?—Yes, except a canal of my own.

22384. Your attention has been a good deal drawn to railroads, from your business and great connexions in the iron trade?—Yes.

22385. And you sold those shares before the Act passed, your consideration being, you had released yourself from all responsibility except the call, which was paid?—Yes.

22386. At what time did you effect this transfer between the Birmingham and Derby, and the North Midland?—Prior to the passing of the North Midland Act.

22387. Did you consider yourself released from all liability when you transferred those shares?—I did.

22388. Did you consider that the person from whom you got the 200 shares in

in the Birmingham and Derby, got rid of his responsibility, and that you became liable?—Yes, upon the same principle.

22389. Was the transfer of the shares between the Birmingham and Derby, and North Midland, before either Act was obtained?—No, the Birmingham and Derby was obtained, the North Midland was not.

22390. Since that the North Midland has been got?—Yes.

22391. Do you consider you have a claim upon the directors in the Brighton Company to be registered for those shares you have purchased, suppose the Act should become law?—Unquestionably; that is my impression.

22392. Is your impression generally upon the subject, that the directors have not the power to refuse any person?—It is a mere matter of opinion, to which my thoughts were never drawn before; that is my opinion, certainly.

22393. Your attention has been much directed to the subject of canals, and things of that kind?—Yes; I consider if anybody presents one of these scrips, and demands to be registered as a shareholder, and no claim was made upon him for a payment which he refuses, he is entitled to be a shareholder; that is my opinion.

22394. If any claim was made upon him which he acceded to, he would still be entitled?—No doubt.

22395. Was it under the impression that that was the law and the practice, that you have bought and sold, and trafficked in the shares in the manner you have told the Committee?—Yes, it was.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22396. I believe you are no lawyer?—No.

22397. And therefore do not pretend to give a very accurate opinion upon the construction of the deed or the Act of Parliament?—I only give the opinion under which I acted.

22398. Your impression?—Yes.

22399. You have not read the Act to see what the clauses are?—Certainly not.

22400. It is hardly necessary to ask, though I should like to have it upon the minutes; you have been asked the number of shares you have subscribed, are you fully competent to meet the liabilities upon those shares you hold?—Yes, I hope so.

22401. Mr. Moser's name has been mentioned; have you any doubt of his competency to meet his liabilities upon the shareholders?—Not the slightest in the world, from my knowledge of his capital in the house in which I am a partner.

22402. Have you been applied to, to register your shares in the London and Cambridge?—No, I have not.

22403. Do you know whether the shares formerly held by you have been registered in other names?—I made an inquiry, and the answer was, that 105 shares of the 200 I sold, have been registered; I made the inquiry lately.

22404. When was it you were apprised that a number of your shares were registered in the London and Cambridge?—Six weeks or two months since.

22405. For aught you know, all the rest may have been registered since?—Yes, for I never made any inquiry but that one.

Re-examined by Mr. *Alexander.*

22406. You say you have not been called upon to register?—No.

22407. Have you not seen the advertisement calling upon persons to come in and register?—I was not a holder.

22408. Have you not seen that advertisement?—I do not know that I have.

22409. Is it not usual?—I had, in consequence of a conversation with my partner, Mr. Routh, who had some knowledge upon the subject, heard that an application was made to him to register.

22410. Do you not know there was a general application to persons to come in?—No, I do not, except from that gentleman.

22411. You say you have learned that 105 of your shares are registered; how can you trace them?—I only asked the question.

22412. Of whom?—Mr. Rowcroft.

 22413. The

Mr. *W. Crawshay.*

7 June 1837.

22413. The clerk of the company?—Yes.

22414. Is there any means by which they can be traced?—I suppose so, or he would not have given me that answer.

22415. Is there any name upon the scrip?—No.

22416. You do not yourself know that those shares were yours except what Mr. Rowcroft told you?—I knew it from looking over the book with Mr. Rowcroft.

22417. Have you kept a memorandum of the numbers of those shares?—No.

22418. How did he know?—The scrip are numbered.

22419. Have you kept a memorandum of the numbers?—No; but the original numbers are appropriated. For instance, my name was No. 1 to No. 200; those numbers, when they are registered, must be marked off to the person in whose name they are, and I think I can show that that was the case in the London and Cambridge.

22420. That would enable the persons at the office to trace the shares; but could you trace those shares now registered to the extent of 105 as being yours?—In no other way except through the book.

22421. You do not know the persons in whose names they are registered?—No.

22422. You do not know whether they are solvent or insolvent?—No.

22423. Mr. *Vizard.*] Do not the certificates contain numbers pointing out the numbers of the shares you hold?—Yes, the scrip all contain numbers.

22424. When you went to the book of the London and Cambridge you found that the book specified the number of shares delivered to you?—Yes.

22425. Not only the number taken, but each number?—Yes.

22426. Having this information from your own certificates, and going to the book, is there any difficulty in connecting the purchasers of the shares with the original holders?—None.

22427. Supposing it has passed through 40 hands, if the last holder carries his certificates to the book, the certificates showing what the numbers were, has he any difficulty in finding out the original holder?—Not the least.

22428. Mr. *Thornely.*] You have stated you were extensively engaged in the iron trade?—Yes.

22429. From the extension of railways you promised yourself great benefit?—Yes; and we have in the iron trade experienced very great advantage from it.

[The Witness withdrew.

Mr. *Lewis Michael Simon,* was called in.

Mr. *L. M. Simon.*

Mr. *Vizard* stated that Mr. Simon being a stockbroker, he should object to his being asked about any transactions in which he had been employed for other persons, they being purely of a confidential nature.

Mr. *Alexander* stated that Mr. Vizard had better wait till some question was put to which an objection arose.

The Witness was then Examined, as follows:

22430. Mr. *Alexander.*] YOU are a stockbroker?—Yes; but it is my intention not to state anything I have done for anybody else. As far as I am individually concerned, and as far as anything I have had to do in Brighton shares, I should have great pleasure in affording any information to the Committee; but as regards other persons I hope the Committee will not require it, as it would be a breach of duty, and, let the consequences be what they might, I could not answer it.

22431. Are you a subscriber to the deed for Stephenson's Line?—Yes, I am.

22432. To what extent?—Fifty-five shares, I believe.

22433. Are you not a subscriber in more than one place?—I do not know; if I had been told before I would have looked into it.

22434. Are those your own shares?—They were.

22435. Do you hold any of them now?—Of those identical shares none.

22436. Do you hold any others?—Yes, I hold 45 at this moment.

22437. How long have you had those 45?—I should think a month or six weeks, or two months; I would have been prepared with the dates if I had known the object of the questions.

22438. Was it in the month of April you purchased them, or did you purchase them?—Yes.

22439. In

22439. In the market?—Yes.

22440. For yourself?—Yes.

22441. You think it was about six weeks ago?—Yes.

22442. Will you tell the Committee when you disposed of the 55 shares you subscribed the deed for?—I cannot tell the dates, but I can produce them.

22443. About when was it?—Very soon after the shares were distributed at a small premium.

22444. Do you mean in the autumn of 1835?—Yes; Mr. Till knows the time.

22445. How does Mr. Till happen to know the time you disposed of your shares?—He does not know that; I asked him the time they were distributed.

22446. Did you sell the whole of the 55 shares at once?—I think not.

22447. Did you sell them all within short intervals of each other?—Yes.

22448. And all at a premium?—Yes.

22449. Then, from the autumn of 1835, till six weeks ago, you were not the holder of any shares in this company?—I do not engage to say that; I may have bought shares and sold some in the meantime.

22450. Can you state whether you did or not?—I cannot say positively; I can tell you to-morrow.

22451. I am speaking of shares you bought for yourself?—Yes, of course.

22452. Did you traffic in shares in Stephenson's Line between the autumn of 1835 to six weeks ago?—Yes, no doubt I have bought and sold them again.

22453. Did you retain any of those you bought for any considerable length of time?—Not very long, I dare say.

22454. You say you sold those 55 shares soon after they were allotted; were they originally allotted to you?—That I am not quite sure of.

22455. Or did you purchase letters of appropriation?—I am not sure whether they were originally allotted to me; I know I paid the deposit and signed the deed.

22456. You may have done that upon letters of appropriation you purchased; such things are sold?—Not in this instance.

22457. Were letters of appropriation of shares sold?—I believe not; I should think not.

22458. You do not know?—I should say distinctly not; in this case there were none.

22459. *Chairman.*] Can you say positively there were not?—Yes.

22460. Mr. *Alexander.*] How did you become possessed of 55 shares?—If they were not originally allotted to me, I am not certain whether it was 45 or 55, I bought them in the market.

22461. I understand you have signed the deed for 55 shares, and it was very shortly after they were issued?—I signed the deed before they were issued. I could not sign the deed till I paid the deposit.

22462. Not before the allotment was made?—No.

22463. You sold them very shortly after you got them?—Yes.

22464. Then do I understand you have signed the deed for any you bought in the market?—I will assume I had 45 allotted to me; then the other 10 shares, supposing it was so, I should have bought in the market, and I should have taken the banker's receipt to the office, and I should have got myself inscribed for 55 shares.

22465. Would not the person to whom the banker's receipt had been sold have signed the deed?—No, he only signs the deed previous to exchanging.

22466. The banker's receipts were sold in the market if the letters of appropriation were not?—I really cannot recollect; I should almost think they were; we were dealing largely in hundreds of other companies.

22467. Mr. *Vizard,* to Mr. *Till.*] How many were allotted to Mr. Simon?—Fifty-five; he paid the deposit of 275*l.* October the 2d, and the shares were delivered October the 15th to Mr. Simon himself, and he signed the deed no doubt the same day, and certainly before the shares were put into his hands.

22468. Mr. *Clarkson,* to Mr. *Simon.*] You are an original subscriber for 55 shares?—Yes.

22469. You do not recollect the exact time after you got them that you sold them?—No, I do not.

Mr. *L. M. Simon.*

7 June 1837.

22470. I mean, within how many days?—No, I have not the slightest recollection whether it was a fortnight or a month.

22471. Do you recollect the state of the market?—About 3*l.* premium.

22472. Do you recollect the state of the market at the time you bought those you now hold?—They cost me about 2*l.* a share.

22473. Have the shares in Stephenson's Line been in the market between the time of their coming to the House for an Act and the determination of the Committee upon the subject, like all other companies?—Yes.

22474. Have they been the subject of purchase and sale?—Every day.

22475. To a great extent?—Yes, to a great extent.

22476. Do you consider yourself responsible to the directors of Stephenson's Line, in the event of their obtaining the Act, for the 55 shares you have sold, and for which you have signed the deed?—

The *Chairman* suggested that this was a question turning upon the legal construction of the deed.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated the object of the question.

22477. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you consider yourself responsible for any portion of the 55 shares?—I imagine I am bound for what I have signed till the Act is obtained; I am no lawyer.

22478. After the Act is obtained, supposing it to be obtained, is it the opinion of the house, of which you are a very respectable member, that the parties who originally signed this deed are responsible?—I should presume it depends upon the Act of Parliament; I am unable to answer the question.

22479. When you parted with your shares, you parted with them upon uncertainty of what the Act might enact?—I knew what I considered my liability; I considered myself liable for 5,500*l.*

22480. Did you consider that your liability would cease upon the passing of the Act?—I never considered it much.

22481. Did you part with your shares without considering whether you should or not remain liable after the Act passed?—I did not consider I was liable after the Act passed.

22482. And upon that consideration, you parted with the shares?—Yes.

22483. For those which you shall hold, at the time the Act passes, you will consider yourself liable, if the Act ever passes, if you apply to register them?—Yes.

22484. If you do not apply to register them, you do not consider yourself liable?—Not upon the scrip.

22485. Can you tell me whether that is prevailing doctrine upon the Stock Exchange?—I do not know.

22486. Was there a time at which you were not a proprietor of any shares?—Yes.

22487. Can you give the Committee a notion of the extent of your dealings in Stephenson's shares?—For other persons, or myself?

22488. The extent of your dealings for yourself and others, whose names I do not at present ask?—

Mr. *Vizard* objected to inquiriesin to the transactions of the Witness for other persons, he being employed by them as their confidential broker.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated his object was to ascertain the extent of the trafficking in shares, while the Act was in progress.

The *Committee* decided that the question might be asked as to the amount of the dealings of the Witness generally for himself and others.

Witness.] For myself they have been very small indeed; for others very large; large, I would not say very large.

22489. Some thousands of shares?—Not thousands.

22490. *Chairman.*] Since the shares first came out to the present period?—As a rude guess, I should say, a thousand shares bought and sold.

22491. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Do you mean bought a thousand and sold a thousand. as a rude guess, during the whole period?—I have certainly bought 500 and sold 500.

22492. *Chairman.*] In any one week, what has been the number?—

22493. Mr. *Clarkson.*]

22493. Mr. *Clarkson.*] In the week preceding the determination of the Committee upon the subject of the engineering matter of Stephenson's Line, can you tell us the number?—

Mr. *Vizard* suggested whether the Witness was not giving information prejudicial to those who had confidentially employed him.

The *Chairman* stated that professional communications were considered privileged, but he never understood that these transactions were to be considered privileged communications.

Mr. *Vizard* stated that the Witness had already said he should decline to answer the questions.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated that the Witness had refused to answer a question totally different.

The *Chairman* stated that it was a matter of discretion for the counsel how far he would press the question, but, as a matter of opinion upon the dry point, he (the Chairman) was not aware that this could be considered a privileged communication.

22494. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Will you be so good as to tell the Committee whether, upon any one occasion, you ever disposed of in the market as many as 600 shares?—Never, by any chance.

22495. Will you inform the Committee whether upon any occasion, in the course of any week, you disposed of as many shares as that?—I should say decidedly not.

22496. Can you with convenience tell us now what number of shares, to the best of your judgment, is the gross amount you may have disposed of, in any one week, in Stephenson's Line; I do not want to know for whom?—I am so entirely unfurnished with any note upon the subject, I cannot tell; if you had furnished me with a hint yesterday, I would have been prepared; I should say I have never bought more than 300, or sold more than 300, in any one week.

22497. Now, be so good as to attend to the question I am about to put to you; I do not ask you the private transactions of any person; are you the broker of Mr. Crawshay?—I am not; I have not that honour.

22498. Are you the broker of Mr. Routh?—I must decline answering any question of that kind.

Chairman.] You must state whether you are the broker of Mr. Crawshay or Mr. Routh.

22499. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Are you the broker of Mr. Routh; you need not answer it unless you like?—I decline to answer.

22500. Are you the broker of Mr. Goldsmid?—I must decline answering any question as to the parties employing me.

22501. You decline answering whether you are the broker of Mr. Goldsmid or Mr. Routh?—That is not quite my answer; I decline answering as to whom I am broker for.

22502. You have not done it in every instance; you have given it the negative?—I did in one instance.

22503. Are you the broker of Mr. Jones?—I beg to refer to the answer I have given.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, he proposed to ask the Witness whether he had any objection to tell the Committee whether, upon any particular date, he had any transactions in Stephenson's shares on behalf of any of the provisional committee of the company, and though he did not admit the Witness was not bound to answer the question, he should not press it if he declined to answer it.

22504. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you any objection to tell the Committee whether upon any particular day or days, and when, you had any transactions in Stephenson's shares, as broker to any of the gentlemen who are upon the provisional committee of that company?—I do object to answer it.

22504.* I take it for granted you would object to tell me whether those dealings, if there were such, were advantageous or otherwise to those gentlemen?—I refer to the answer I have given.

22505. Can you tell us whether the shares were ever as high as 15 premium?—Yes, higher.

Mr. *L. M. Simon.*
7 June 1837.

22506. They were in the list 17¾?—Seventeen or 18; I think 18.

22507. Will your experience tell me what they were a month ago?—At a discount.

22508. Now they are at a greater discount?—About the same; perhaps I may add, I bought a great many shares at a very high premium.

22509. For yourself?—No.

22510. I have no objection to your adding that, if you will tell me for whom?—I cannot do that.

22511. Have you sold a great many at a very high premium?—Not near so many as I have bought.

22512. Have you the means of ascertaining the amount respectively of each?—Yes, certainly.

22513. Will you have the goodness to let us have it to-morrow?—Very well.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22514. You say that you believe that you may have bought and sold, from first to last, about 1,000 shares; is that founded upon any accurate recollection, or merely a loose guess?—Not at all; I said it was a mere rude guess.

22515. Does the same apply to your other statement, that you may have bought and sold to the number of 300 in one week?—About 300 at the outside.

22516. I will ask you this general question, whether these shares were or not in greater estimation in the market than any other shares where the Act had not been passed?—Certainly, I do not know any that bore so high a premium.

22517. May I ask whether that proceeded from the confidence the public had in the directors and the concern itself?—I conceive it arose from the great confidence they had in the provisional committee, and from the parties who it was generally known held the shares.

22518. Do you know, or, in the course of your experience on the Stock Exchange, did you ever discover, or have you any reason to believe that any unusual means were resorted to by any one individual, or by any one of the committee, to enhance the value of the shares?—Certainly not.

Mr. *Richard Lambert Jones,* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *R. L. Jones.*

22519. Mr. *Clarkson.*] ARE you a subscriber to this deed?—I am.

22520. For 12 shares?—A great many more than that; 172 shares; it is in two places in the deed.

22521. Did you sign the deed once or more than once?—Twice.

22522. Did you not sign it three times?—Yes; 22, 50 and 100.

22523. Were they your own shares?—Yes.

22524. All of them?—Yes; I signed also for other parties; it stands in the name of a lady in Worcestershire and Henry Ricketts.

22525. That is in the other deed?—No, in the same deed.

22526. Those three, the signatures are your own?—Yes; but I have signed for four individuals, a clergyman's widow in Worcestershire and Mr. Nash.

22527. *Chairman.*] By procuration?—No, by letter.

22528. It is stated in the deed you signed for another party?—Yes.

22529. Mr. *Clarkson.*] In the other cases, when you signed for others, you so stated it?—Yes.

22530. You signed three times; how does it happen all three follow each other in this list?—They do not in the deed.

22531. Did it arise from your disposition to take shares at one time and then at another?—It was from the opinion I had of them.

22532. And you subscribed the deed for 172 shares?—Yes, besides the others I signed for other parties.

22533. Are you one of the directors of this company?—One of the provisional committee.

22534. In other words, a director till the Act passes?—Yes.

22535. Have you any of those shares now?—Yes.

22536. How many?—Fifty.

22537. Of the same shares for which you originally subscribed?—No.

22538. Have

22538. Have you any of the shares for which you originally subscribed?—Thirty.

22539. From which you have never parted?—From which I have never parted.

22540. When did you purchase the 20?—I should think it was within this month or six weeks.

22541. Since this Committee has been sitting?—Yes.

22542. When did you first sell any portion of the 170 for which you subscribed the deed?—I should think it was about May or June 1836; it was about that time.

22543. Do you recollect when it was the Bill was stopped last session?—In August.

22544. How long was it before that?—Some time before that.

22545. You recollect it?—Yes; some considerable time before that, certainly.

22546. Did you dispose of them all to one person?—No.

22547. Did you dispose of them in the market?—No; I sold some through a broker, and some I parted with to a friend. I gave a friend some, indeed; and a very respectable individual too.

22548. Such as you sold through the broker; were they sold at a premium?—Yes.

22549. All that you sold?—No; I sold a great many at a discount.

22550. When?—After the Bill was thrown out last year; and this year I sold at a discount.

22551. I am afraid you could not sell in any other way?—Yes, I might, some day; I sold at two discount and one discount.

22552. Were you aware at the time you sold your shares that the deed you had subscribed refused to recognize, on the part of the subscribers, any transfer of shares before the Act passed?—No.

22553. If you had been aware of it should you have transferred your shares while that provision remained in the deed?—I considered myself, at the time I signed the deed, that I was liable, unless the directors chose to release me by accepting another person.

22554. That is not an answer to the question; you told me you were not aware of the clause in the deed that the subscribers would not recognize the transfer of shares before the passing of the Act?—I was not aware of it: but I was aware before any share was issued, from Mr. Vizard, that every subscriber to that deed was liable, and his property, unless he was released by the directors by the substitution of another person.

22555. By registering the shares?—Yes; or any other mode.

22556. Did you know that that proviso was in the deed; never mind what Mr. Vizard told you?—I did not recollect that such a proviso was in the deed.

22557. Were you ever aware that there was such a proviso in the deed?—No; but I knew my liability.

22558. You knew what Mr. Vizard told you was your liability?—Yes; and I knew the common sense of it.

22559. When you disposed of any of your shares in the market, you were not aware you were a subscriber to the deed with such a proviso in it?—No; I was aware of the liability.

22560. Were you aware you were a subscriber to a deed in which you expressed your disinclination to recognize the transfer of shares before the Act passed?—I can give no other answer than I have; I hold myself responsible.

22561. If you had known there was that proviso, should you have sold your shares in the market?—I should have perhaps paused before I did so.

22562. Why should you have paused?—I should have the same view of it as to my responsibility.

22563. Why should you have paused?—I should have considered whether that interpretation would have prevented my selling; the interpretation of one person's mind may be one way, and another another.

22564. Have you purchased any other shares in the market besides those you have subscribed for?—Twenty.

22565. Any others?—No.

22566. Through whom did you sell, when you sold?—Through Mr. Hutchinson.

22567. *Chairman.*] Is he a broker?—Yes.

Mr. *R. L. Jones.*

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

7 June 1837.

22568. You say you signed the deed for other parties; do you know whether that was a separate deed, distinct from the original contract?—I believe it was.

22569. There were two sorts of deeds?—Yes.

22570. That was explained to you at the time?—Yes; and that if necessary, the parties must be called upon to sign the original document.

22571. It was used as a matter of convenience?—Yes.

[The Witness withdrew.

William Vizard, Esq., made the following statement:

W. Vizard, Esq.

I was asked yesterday to produce my tickets, in order to show whether they were original shares, I have brought them with me for that purpose.

22572. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Be so good as to read the numbers?—7,316 to 7,320 five shares; 7,321 to 7,325.

22573. Are they original shares?—Mr. Till tells me they are original shares issued to me; they are the tickets of original shares.

22574. *Chairman.*] Is there any further explanation you have to offer?—I said I had sold some of these shares and bought some in the London and Cambridge, and I sold again; I think I said that those latter transactions of mine produced no profit to me, rather a loss. It has been stated that a circular was sent round, signed in the name of myself and my partner, announcing the distribution of shares; I wish to state we had nothing whatever to do with the distribution; I never knew to whom the distribution was made, or by whom made; the letter was lithographed, and I think our names lithographed also; it was only used because we were solicitors to the company, and there was no secretary.

22575. Who did distribute the shares?—I do not know; it was done among the provisional committee, to which we were no parties; certainly, not myself; and my partner tells me had nothing to do with it. With a view to some of the questions put to me as to my liability, I should wish to state, that these shares show there is no difficulty in tracing the shares, and I am, therefore, not imposing upon any parties who purchased shares from me, because the holder of the shares, through whatever hands they may have passed has no difficulty in going to the book and finding that I am the person to whom he is to look to make the transfer.

22576. Mr. *Thornely.*] Because every share is numbered?—Any man producing these tickets, can ascertain from Mr. Till that they were issued to Mr. Vizard, and Mr. Vizard is the person to make the transfer.

22577. *Chairman.*] Whether before or after the Act, the number being attached to each share, you have only to have recourse to the books of the company, to show to whom the shares were first issued?—Yes; every man purchasing in the market can trace by whom the transfer is to be made. The former Act prescribes that the transfer shall be made when required by any party presenting himself, the deposits and the calls up to that time having been paid, so that any purchaser under me could compel me to make the transfer, and compel me to pay the calls to enable me so to transfer, supposing he was not to apply till after a call had been made under the Act of Parliament.

22578. Mr. *Brotherton.*] Would the register of the numbers under the Act of Parliament be the same as the numbers in the certificate?—The register is not made up till after the Act has passed; and there may be new numbers, but the Act prescribes that a certificate shall be given under the common seal in exchange for those certificates, and the person presenting those certificates would be entitled to be registered, all calls having been paid; that is, if the original holder came and claimed to have his assignee registered; that is the effect of the Bill, and I believe in that respect this Bill is like all other Bills relating to this subject.

22579. *Chairman.*] Is there any other point you have to mention?—A good deal has been said about the value of these shares in the market; I should wish to state one circumstance that very much contributed to that, the provisional committee for promoting this line——

Mr. *Clarkson* objected to Mr. Vizard making the statement he was about to make.

The *Chairman* stated, that it was a mere matter of opinion, and that it was not worth while to go into it.

22580. Mr.

W. Vizard, Esq.

7 June 1837.

22580. Mr. *Clarkson.*] You have told me just now you had some shares in the London and Cambridge?—Yes.

22581. How many?—I do not recollect.

22582. About how many?—To my belief 50, but I do not know.

22583. May they have been more?—Yes, they may.

22584. Twice as many?—I cannot tell whether it is 50 or 100; I know they gave me some shares, and I know I hold more shares than I took originally; I know that the shares are at a discount.

22585. They gave you some shares?—They allotted me some shares; that is what I mean by giving, upon which I paid the deposit.

22586. Did you apply for them?—I think I did.

22587. Do you believe you did?—I have not the least doubt of it; I have no recollection whether the directors said there are so many shares for you, or whether I asked for them.

22588. Have you registered for them?—I think I have; upon further consideration, I know I have.

22589. For every one you held?—I know I am registered for more than they originally allotted to me.

22590. Have you registered for the shares originally allotted to you?—I have no doubt it is the same individual shares; I know I have registered for more, and I have no doubt it is for the same shares.

Mr. *Leonard Redmayne,* was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. *L. Redmayne.*

22591. Mr. *Clarkson.*] DID you subscribe Stephenson's deed?—Yes, I did.

22592. You are described in the deed as of 176, Oxford-street, upholsterer?—I was residing there at the time I subscribed it; but I am also resident in Lancaster.

22593. Are you a partner in the respectable house, known by the name of Gillow & Co.?—Yes.

22594. Were you an applicant for shares in Stephenson's Line?—Not directly myself, but at the time they were taken I was a director of the Lancaster bank, and they were taken by my brother directors in my name, for several persons who had accounts with the bank.

22595. *Chairman.*] They were taken by your brother directors in the Lancaster bank?—Yes.

22596. Was it in pursuance of orders from those parties who banked with the Lancaster bank?—Yes, by the orders of the customers of the bank.

22597. Mr. *Clarkson.*] To how many different persons did the shares belong?—I really cannot recollect, for I have had no communication since upon the subject since I signed the deed.

22598. After you signed the deed, you paid the deposit?—It was paid.

22599. Did you pay it?—No, it was paid by the Lancaster bank.

22600. Not by yourself?—No.

22601. Did you take any papers with you when you signed the deed?—No, a party called upon me at my own place to subscribe the deed.

22602. What party?—I do not think I should recollect the gentleman who called upon me.

22603. The name affixed as the subscribing witness is Henry Leman; is that the gentleman there [*pointing to Mr. Leman*]?—No.

Mr. *Leman.*] It is my brother; he went by my direction; he shall attend the Chairman when you please.

22604. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Some person called upon you with the deed, and you subscribed it?—Yes.

22605. You produce no banker's receipt?—No, I might produce the letter of the directors, with a request that I would sign it; I probably might.

22606. Where did you get that from?—From Lancaster.

22607. Was it directed from the bank at Lancaster?—Yes, to myself.

22608. *Chairman.*] That was a letter signifying to you that certain shares had been allotted?—Yes, it was; and that I should be expected to subscribe to the deed.

22609. Mr. *Clarkson.*] It was a letter from the directors of the undertaking?—No, from the directors of the Lancaster bank.

Mr. *L. Redmayne.*

7 June 1837.

22610. Directing you to subscribe the deed?—Yes.

22611. But you received no letter from Stephenson's company, requesting you to sign the deed?—I am not aware that I did.

22612. When you subscribed the deed, did you tell the gentlemen before whom you subscribed it, that you signed it for the gentlemen at the Lancaster bank?—I cannot tell whether I did or not; I presume I did.

22613. At all events, you produced the letter from the gentleman at the Lancaster bank?—I cannot charge my memory, but I presume I did so; but since that period I have had no communication upon the subject.

22614. Did you receive, upon your subscription of the deed, any scrip of any kind?—No, I did not.

22615. Were you the party who had applied to the company or the provisional direction for shares to be allotted to you?—Not directly; but as a director with the other directors, I might be considered as applying.

22616. There was an application made by the directors of the Lancaster bank for shares, of which direction you were one, and those shares were for the customers of that bank?—Yes, several persons.

22617. Did you at any time receive the scrip?—No, I have never received any communication whatever since that period.

22618. *Chairman.*] You signed in your own name and not as one of the firm?—Yes, I signed my own name at my residence.

22619. Is that a joint-stock bank?—Yes.

22620. Mr. *Thornely.*] Did the letter of the directors make any statement to you as to the payment of deposits?—I cannot recollect; I have not the letter with me, and I have been residing since at Lancaster; the letter is there now, but I should think the letter would mention the deposit.

22621. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Am I to understand that you yourself never held scrip for the value of 11,000 *l.*, for which you signed the deed?—I never had any shares myself at all.

22622. And never received any vouchers for shares?—I believe not.

22623. When was it you subscribed the deed?—I think it might be in June or July last year; I cannot be certain as to the period.

22624. Were you asked, at the time you signed the deed, by anybody whether you were the person that held the shares?—I do not recollect that question being asked me.

22625. Was any question asked you, or were you merely asked to sign the deed?—I was asked to sign the deed as having had a certain number of shares allotted to me.

22626. *Chairman.*] Was it inquired of you, previous to your signing, whether the deposits had been paid?—No, there was no such question put to me.

22627. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Have you reason to believe that the deposits were paid before or after that time?—I have not the least doubt but that they had been paid; I am not certain of it, but I have not the least doubt of it.

22628. What has become of those shares you do not know?—No, I have had no communication since.

22629. Who has them, or how many hands they have gone through, you do not know?—No.

22630. Mr. *Thornely.*] Are you aware whether the directors of the joint-stock bank in Lancaster ever received the certificates of those shares, and distributed them to the persons for whom they were subscribed?—I should presume they have, but I have seen nothing of them.

22631. Have you seen any correspondence of your secretary since that upon the subject?—No; I have been chiefly resident here since that period.

22632. *Chairman.*] Do you know to what extent you have made yourself liable?—Yes, I was aware of that.

22633. What was your opinion of your liability?—That they were for 100 *l.* shares.

22634. Did you understand that you became liable for that amount?—I was aware I was then liable for the amount subscribed for.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22635. You are a partner in this bank?—In the Lancaster bank.

22636. Did you apply for the shares, or did the bank apply for them?—The bank applied for them.

22637. And

Mr. *L. Redmayne.*

7 June 1837.

22637. And you, as one of the partners in the bank, were requested to sign the deed?—Yes; I was then residing in London.

22638. Were you aware by so doing you undertook a personal liability yourself?—Yes, I was aware of that.

22639. You have not received any scrip?—No.

22640. Do you remember authorizing a Mr. Forster to receive the scrip for you?—Mr. Forster would receive it.

22641. Was he the broker of the house?—Yes.

22642. You say it was last spring you signed the deed?—Last June or July.

22643. Trace in your recollection whether it was not the October preceding; the actual date is the 5th of October?—I am not aware of the date exactly.

22644. *Chairman.*] From the books of the company what appears to be the date?—

Mr. *Till.*] The deposit was paid to Messrs. Williams & Deacon, October the 5th 1835, and the shares were delivered October 23d, and Mr. Redmayne must have signed the deed previous to those shares being delivered out.

22645. You mean from the manner in which the business was conducted?—Yes.

Re-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

22646. Does the letter which announced to the company the desire of the directors of the Lancaster bank to take shares, communicate to them that the shares were for their customers?—I did not see the letter that communicated it to them.

22647. But that was the fact?—Yes.

22648. You have no interest in the shares?—No.

22649. Was it the fact that the shares were applied for by the directors of the Lancaster bank on their own behalf or for their customers?—For their customers.

22650. Had the directors of the Lancaster bank any interest in it?—None that I know of.

22651. Mr. *Vizard.*] Do you know whether any of the parties connected with the railway company were apprised of it, that the shares asked for by the bank, and at their request put in your name, were for the use of their customers?—I do not think that would be named to the railway company; I should think it was not.

[The Witness withdrew.

Thomas Webber, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Thomas Webber.

22652. Mr. *Clarkson.*] ARE you one of the messengers in the South-Eastern Railway Company's Office?—Yes, I am.

22653. Have you inquired after a gentleman of the name of Arthur Savage, described in the deed as of 168, Fleet-street, gentleman?—One hundred and sixty-eight; yes.

22654. A gentleman, described in the deed as having signed it twice for 1,500 *l.* each time; is there any such person living at 168, Fleet-street?—No, there is not.

22655. Who is living at 168, Fleet-street?—I cannot say what the person's name is living there, but it is a chemist and druggist's.

22656. To whom did you address your inquiry?—To a gentleman in that establishment.

22657. To the chemist and druggist?—Yes.

22658. What answer did you get from him when you asked for Mr. Savage?—That no such gentleman lived there.

22659. Did you hear how long the gentleman you found there had lived there?—Yes.

22660. How long had he lived there?—Many years.

22661. Did he know such a gentleman as Arthur Savage?—Yes.

22662. Did he tell you who he was?—He did not know anything of him.

22663. I asked you if he knew such a person?—He knew such a person, but he did not know anything of him.

22664. Have the goodness to render that into English?—He did not know anything about him.

 22665. *Chairman.*]

Thomas Webber.

7 June 1837.

22665. *Chairman.*] He did not know anything of his character and pursuits? —Yes, that is what I mean.

22666. Mr. *Clarkson.*] Had he lived in that house?—A twelvemonth back he had.

22667. Did you learn what business he had carried on there?—They did not know what business.

22668. Did he lodge there?—Yes.

22669. Was there any person from whom you could obtain information who Mr. Savage was?—No.

22670. Have you inquired after another person, in the Kingsland-road, described here as C. P. Marie de Buck, 9, Kingsland-road?—Yes.

22671. Could you find out anything about him?—No; no such person lived there.

22672. What shop is No. 9, Kingsland-road?—A glass warehouse.

22673. Did you learn whether such a person had lived there in the last two or three years?—No person of that name had lived there for many years.

22674. Do you know of any other No. 9 but that?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Vizard.*

22675. You say that Mr. Savage has signed the deed twice; what is your authority for saying that?—

Mr. *Clarkson.* The printed list.

22676. Mr. *Vizard.*] You learned that Mr. Savage lived there a year ago?—Yes.

22677. *Chairman*, to Mr. *Till.*] Do you know anything about a Mr. C. P. Marie de Buck?—Yes, he is a partner in the house of Lemmé, No. 1, Finsbury Circus.

22678. Mr. *Vizard.*] What are they?—Mediterranean merchants.

22679. Of great respectability?—Yes; I do not know why he is described as of Kingsland-road; he is described in these books as of No. 1, Finsbury Circus; here it is in the deed, John Lemmé, gent.; and then Mr. de Buck describes himself as of No. 9, Kingsland-road; Kingsland-road is a large place. I know him to be one of the most respectable men in the city of London; he must know his own residence, I suppose.

[The Witness withdrew.

The *Chairman* stated, unless these cases could be proved to an amount to reduce the subscription list below the 50 per cent., it was hardly worth while to go into this inquiry.

Mr. *Till* stated, that it appeared that Mr. Savage signed the deed in September 1835.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, he should not trouble the Committee with any more witnesses, and proceeded to observe upon the evidence which had been adduced in support of the petition for which he appeared.

Mr. *Vizard* requested that Mr. Leman might be examined, in order to remove any doubt that might exist in the minds of the Committee with regard to the deposit of the deed, executed by the parties who signed by procuration.

Mr. *James Leman*, was called in; and Examined, as follows:

Mr. James Leman.

22680. *Chairman.*] DID you deposit in the Private Bill Office the deed containing the signatures of the parties who signed by procuration?—Yes, I did.

22681. When?—I forget the precise day; I think it was in December last; the deed was quadruple; there were four copies, and they were all tied together, making in truth one packet, and the committee clerk gave me only a receipt as for one deed, but there were four deeds tied together precisely in the same way as I deposited it in the session of 1835.

22682. Mr. *Vizard.*] Were they in that shape produced before the Standing Order Committee?—I believe they were.

22683. *Chairman.*] You believe that that deed, with the others, was produced?—Yes; I am wrong in the date; the deposit was in February, before the tition for the Bill was presented; that is required by the Standing Orders.

Cross-

Cross-examined by Mr. *Clarkson.*

22684. Was anybody with you when you deposited it?—Mr. Heyward, the Parliamentary agent.

22685. Who tied them up?—I did myself.

22686. Where at?—In Lincoln's Inn Fields; my stationer copied them, and to show there was no mistake, four copies were made.

22687. Did you read the receipt you received?—I do not know that a receipt was given; I saw the entry in the book.

22688. I thought you said when he gave the receipt it was for one deed?—It was given to Mr. Heyward.

22689. Are you quite certain you were the hand that deposited the deed with the clerk?—Yes, I am.

22690. Who was the clerk?—I think his name was Thompson, and, in confirmation of what I have said, he said he received four deeds.

22691. He said that?—Yes, and without my making inquiry; the moment I saw the print without that deed, I directed inquiries to be made at the Private Bill Office, and that long before this petition was presented; I directed inquiries to be made, and I learned it was lost between the Private Bill Office and the printer's.

22692. Was that copy on parchment or paper?—Upon paper, in this form. *(Brief form.)*

22693. Did you examine it yourself before the deposit?—No.

22694. Who did?—A clerk in my office.

22695. How long before?—A day or two before.

22696. Mr. *Vizard.*] It appears now that all the papers are lost?—They are all lost. It occurred to me, when I saw the print without that deed, that the House of Commons had considered that that deed by procuration was not a deed that came within the Parliamentary directions, and therefore it was omitted.

22697. Did you ever see the four deeds after you say you deposited them in the Private Bill Office?—Never.

22698. Or any of them?—No; I think I must have seen them externally in the Committee upon the Bill.

22699. When you were in the Committee upon the Bill, were the four copies produced there?—They ought to have been.

22700. Did you see them?—No; I understood they were brought every day by the Committee clerk.

Mr. *Clarkson* stated, that he thought it very likely that the casualty alluded to by Mr. Leman had occurred with respect to the deed signed by procuration, and he therefore should not insist upon the point he had raised with respect to that deed.

Mr. *Vizard* was heard to observe upon the evidence which had been produced in support of the petition of J. S. Yeats.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

No. 1.—Petition of James Sebastian Yeats, 17 May 1837 - - - - p. 51

No. 2.—Petition of Provisional Committee, 18 May 1837 - - - - p. 52

No. 3.—Subscribers' Contract - - - - - - - - - p. 55

No. 4.—Subscribers' Agreement - - - - - - - - - p. 56

No. 5.—List of Subscribers - - - - - - - - - p. 59

APPENDIX.

LONDON AND BRIGHTON RAILWAY (STEPHENSON'S LINE.)

Appendix, No. 1.

PETITION of *James Sebastian Yeats*.—17 May 1837.

No. 1.
Petition of
J. Sebastian Yeats.

THE humble Petition of the undersigned James Sebastian Yeats, secretary to the Provisional Committee for forming a Railway from the South Eastern Railway to Brighton, with Branches to Lewes and Newhaven, to be called "The South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway,"

Showeth,

That in the last session of Parliament a Bill was brought into your honourable House for the making a railway from the Southampton Railway to Brighton, upon a line laid down by Messrs. George and Robert Stephenson, and that such Bill did not pass into a law.

That in pursuance of the Standing Orders of your honourable House, the promoters of the said Bill deposited, in the last session of Parliament, in the Private Bill Office, a paper purporting to be a copy of their subscription list, whereby it appeared that 921,200*l.* had been subscribed towards the said undertaking.

That the promoters of the said Bill have, in the present session, renewed their application to Parliament, and have deposited in the Private Bill Office another paper purporting to be a copy of their subscription contract and list.

That in the last-mentioned paper, the names of the shareholders, who are 249 in number, the amount subscribed by them, and the names of the persons attesting the signatures, appear in precisely the same order, and in all respects precisely correspond with those in the first-mentioned list deposited in the last session, with the exceptions hereinafter stated; viz.—

1st. Nine additional names appear on the paper deposited in the present session, which do not appear in the list of the preceding session.

2d. In the paper deposited in the last session there appear subscriptions amounting in the whole to 66,400*l.*, which have been made by James Foster, Henry D'Arbuthnot, Robert Murray, Edward Whistler, Joseph Laurence, Edward Moore, Richard L. Jones, Edward F. Starbuck and W. Scott "for" other persons; and your petitioner has reason to believe that the persons so signing had no legal authority to execute the contract on behalf of the persons whom they represent, and that they could not, in obedience to the Orders of your honourable House, bind such persons, their heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, but that such signatures are improperly added to the said list, in order to make up the aforesaid amount of 921,200*l.*

Your petitioner further alleges, that the last-mentioned unauthorized signatures have been omitted from the paper deposited during the present session in the Private Bill Office, which paper has been imposed on your honourable House as a copy of the subscription contract and list of the said company.

Your petitioner further alleges, that there appear on the said list the names of persons as subscribers for large amounts who are deeply involved in gambling transactions with shares, and who were in the habit, during last session, of executing subscription contracts in order to procure the passing of railway bills, and of afterwards refusing to register their shares when the Bills which they had by their signatures contributed to procure had passed into laws.

That the transactions of the said company, called Stephenson's Brighton Railway Company, were conducted by the directors in such a way as to encourage gambling to an extent profitable to themselves and ruinous to those whose ignorance of the method in which the price of shares is raised in the market, led them to become the victims of the acts of the said directors.

That, by some means unknown to your petitioner, the shares in this speculation were raised to a premium of 15*l.* per share in the market; and your petitioner has reason to believe that the provisional directors of the said company issued shares to the public when they were at a high premium, the purchasers of such shares paying such premium, and that such shares are now comparatively valueless, and are inflicting great loss and distress on the ignorant or unwary persons to whom they were assigned by the said directors.

That the directors and officers of the said company likewise encouraged gambling speculation in their shares, by their individual traffic therein, and have thereby caused great distress, and even ruin, to those who, trusting to the representations of the said directors and officers, purchased their shares.

No. 1.
Petition of J. Sebastian Yeats.

That Mr. William Vizard, who, together with Mr. James Leman, is the London solicitor of the said company, appears on the list of shareholders deposited this session in the Private Bill Office as a subscriber for 75 shares; but your petitioner has been informed, and believes, that the said William Vizard has long since sold his said shares at a large premium, and that such shares are now comparatively worthless.

That Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, esq., whose name appears on the said subscription list deposited in the present session as a holder of 1,390 shares, has, in a petition presented by him to your honourable House against the said undertaking, declared that he was induced by the representations of the promoters of the said Bill to subscribe, for himself, his family and his immediate friends, one-fifth of the whole capital, viz. 200,000*l.*; and that the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid is, or was, a director of the said company; and your petitioner believes that the confidence which was entertained in his wealth and discretion induced many unwary persons to involve themselves in shares of the said company; but your petitioner has been informed, and believes, that the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid has long since sold his shares, or a large portion thereof, and that he has now little or no pecuniary interest in the said undertaking.

That your petitioner has been informed, and believes, that not one-half of the persons whose names appear on the said last deposited list do in fact hold shares in the said undertaking, or did hold them when the list was deposited, in the present session, as before stated.

That there appear in the said last deposited list the names of other persons who have trafficked in the shares of the said company, and who, by selling their shares, had ceased to have any interest whatever in the said undertaking long before the depositing of the said pretended copy of the contract in the Private Bill Office in the present session; and that such persons were known by the promoters of the said Bill, at the time when the said deposit was made, to have no interest in the said undertaking.

That there further appear in the said list the names of various persons who are not worthy the credit of your honourable House for the sums subscribed by them towards the said undertaking.

Your petitioner therefore prays, that your honourable House will be pleased to cause these frauds, and these violations of the privileges of your honourable House, to be inquired into.

And your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Appendix, No. 2.

PETITION of Provisional Committee.—18 May 1837.

No. 2.
Petition of Provisional Committee.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Members of the Provisional Committee for forming a Railway from the Southampton Railway to Brighton, upon a line laid down by Messrs. George and Robert Stephenson,

Showeth,

That your petitioners have read the petition of James Sebastian Yeats, secretary to the provisional committee for forming a railway called "The South Eastern, Brighton and Lewes, and Newhaven Railway," presented to your honourable House on the 17th instant.

That, in the last session of Parliament, a Bill was brought into your honourable House, on behalf of your petitioners, for the making a railway from the Southampton Railway to Brighton, upon a line laid down by Messrs. George and Robert Stephenson.

That your petitioners, as the promoters of the said Bill, have in the present session renewed their application to Parliament.

That the line of railway for which your petitioners are this session seeking to obtain an Act, is in effect and in substance the same line as that for which their application to Parliament was made in the last session.

That after 52 days' investigation, last session, before a Committee of your honourable House, the Committee of your honourable House made a report very strongly in favour of Stephenson's Line, including amongst other matters a report of the usual circumstances connected with the subscription list.

That the report of your Committee was adopted, on a division, by a great majority of your honourable House, and the third reading of your petitioners' Bill was carried in your honourable House without a division.

That, after 21 days' examination before a Committee of the House of Lords, their Lordships in Committee came to the following resolution:

"That it is inexpedient to proceed in this measure in this session of Parliament."

That this resolution alone stopped the further progress of your petitioners' Bill in Parliament last session.

That during the whole progress of those inquiries the subscription lists deposited by your petitioners were in no ways impugned, or attempted to be impugned.

That it is true, as alleged in the petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats, that the shares in the said undertaking were, as your petitioners believe, after the decisions of the Committee of your honourable House, at a premium of 15*l.* per share, but such premium was caused, not by any acts of your petitioners, but by the proceedings and approbation in favour of the said line expressed by your honourable House.

That

No. 2.
Petition of Provisional Committee.

That the capital proposed to be raised, as well in the present as in the last session of Parliament, was one million.

That, in pursuance of the Standing Orders of your honourable House, the promoters of the said Bill deposited, in the last session of Parliament, in the Private Bill Office, four several papers purporting to be copies of the four several subscription contracts entered into pursuant to the Standing Orders of your honourable House, whereby it appeared that 921,200*l.* had been subscribed towards the said undertaking.

That your petitioners deposited in this session, in the said Private Bill Office, precisely the same papers, containing precisely the same names of shareholders, precisely the same number, and precisely the same amounts subscribed for, and precisely the same names of the persons attesting the signatures, and in all respects precisely corresponding with those deposited in the first-mentioned lists in the last session, with the exceptions hereinafter stated; viz.,

That the new additional names appearing on one of the said papers deposited in this session are the names of individuals who have since the last session subscribed the said deed, and become interested in the said undertaking.

That when the lists of subscribers to the different railway undertakings were printed and published by order of your honourable House, your petitioners, on examining the lists printed and published with reference to your petitioners' Bill, found that the same did not contain the list of those persons who had signed one of the said four deeds of contract by procuration, and on behalf of other persons; and your petitioners then applied (about a month or six weeks since) at the Private Bill Office of your honourable House to ascertain the cause that those names were not printed, and were informed that the original papers having been sent to Messrs. Hansard's to be printed, had been lost or mislaid, either at Messrs. Hansard's or at the Private Bill Office of your honourable House; but your petitioners are able to prove that such missing list was with the others left at the Private Bill Office of your honourable House.

That, inasmuch as the printed list of subscriptions (by the subscribers printed, by order of your honourable House, in support of this undertaking,) amounts to 866,500*l.*, and therefore is more in amount than is necessary for the passing of this Bill (pursuant to the Standing Orders) through both Houses of Parliament, your petitioners took no further steps on the subject of the said missing list, and the names not printed; but your petitioners are able to prove that James Foster, Henry D'Arbuthnot, Robert Murray, Edward W. Whistler, Joseph Laurence, Edward Moore, Richard L. Jones, Edward F. Starbuck and W. Scott, who signed for other persons, as stated in the petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats, respectively produced a written authority to execute the contract on behalf of each of the persons for whom they respectively signed, before they were permitted to sign the said contract; and such written authorities are now in the possession of the secretary to your petitioners, and are in most, if not in every instance, to the purport or effect stated in the copy hereunder written, or hereunto annexed.

That if such persons had no power to bind the heirs, executors, administrators or assigns of the persons for whom they respectively signed, still the list of signatures attached by individuals on behalf of themselves, and binding themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, is more than ample to satisfy the Orders of your honourable House; but your petitioners deny that the said signatures by procuration were improperly added to the said list, in order to make up the said amount of 921,200*l.*, for any increase of signatures beyond the sum actually signed for by principals only was not required by the Standing Orders of your honourable House.

And your petitioners deny, for the reasons above stated, that the last-mentioned list of signatures has been omitted from the paper deposited during the present session in the Private Bill Office, and they deny that this paper had been imposed on your honourable House as a copy of the subscription contract and list of the said company; and, on the contrary, your petitioners are prepared to produce the deed itself, and the authorities signed by the parties who originally applied for the shares, authorizing the signature by procuration for each individual whose name appears in the said list.

That, among the subscribers whose names appear in the list to the subscription contract of the South Eastern, Brighton, Lewes and Newhaven Railway, there appear the names of "Alexander Wilson" and "Samuel Robert Healey," and which names respectively were set and subscribed by other parties, on their respective behalf, as appears by reference to the said subscription deed.

That your petitioners are unable to meet the vague and general charges and allegations contained in the petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats, and they have no means of knowing, and do not believe, that on the said list there appear the names of any persons as subscribers for large amounts who are deeply involved in gambling transactions with shares, and who were in the habit during the last session of executing subscription contracts in order to procure the passing of Railway Bills, and of afterwards refusing to register their shares when the Bills, which they had by their signatures contributed to procure, had passed into laws.

Your petitioners also deny that the transactions of the said company were conducted by the directors in such a way as to encourage gambling; and your petitioners submit that the value of the shares and the premium on the same was caused and arose from the well-known fact, that the directors of this undertaking, on a former occasion, when they had reason to be dissatisfied with the line laid down by Sir John Rennie, the engineer who was first employed by them, and when in consequence they then determined to abandon the undertaking,

No. 2. Petition of Provisional Committee.

taking, returned, without any deduction on any account whatever, the whole of the deposits which had been paid by the then subscribers to the then intended undertaking.

And your petitioners further submit, that the value of the shares, and the premium on them, was also in some measure caused, as your petitioners firmly believe, as well by the confidence of the public in the talents and character of the Messrs. Stephenson (the engineers to this undertaking), as by the confidence and support afforded to the same by the proceedings of your honourable House, and was also caused by the fact, that very few shares in the said undertaking were the subject of traffic or speculation in the share market, or were parted with or sold by the original subscribers to the undertaking.

That the provisional directors of the said company deny ever having issued shares to the public at a premium on any occasion, or having received any profit therefrom, beyond the deposit of 5 *l.* per share, payable by all persons to whom shares were allotted, and which in any case was paid into the hands of their bankers before the shares were issued.

That the directors and officers of the said company never encouraged gambling speculations in their shares by their individual traffic therein.

That Mr. William Vizard, who, together with Mr. James Leman, is the London solicitor of the said company, was, on the list of shareholders deposited this session in the Private Bill Office, a subscriber for 75 shares, and, in consequence of the absence of Mr. Vizard from town, your petitioners, though they know he has still a considerable number of shares in the said undertaking, are unable positively to say whether or when he sold any of his said shares, and if he has sold any, at what, if any, premium.

But they submit that Mr. Vizard, like any other individual, had a right to dispose of his shares as he pleased. And your petitioners assert, that the said William Vizard, who is amply responsible for the said sum of 7,500 *l.*, is, even though any such sale should have been effected, still responsible for the amount of his said subscription under the said deed.

That Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, esq., whose name appears in the said subscription list deposited in the present session as a holder of 1,390 shares, was a most willing and zealous supporter of the said undertaking from the commencement thereof, and was during the last session the most active of the promoters of the said Bill; and the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid was a director of the said company.

That the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid retired this year from the said direction, because the line of the said railway, and the terminus thereof, passed through the land of the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid; and his situation as one of the directors of the said company was found inconvenient and incompatible with making the necessary arrangements with him as a landowner on the line.

That your petitioners are unable to say, and have no means whatever of knowing, whether or not the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid has sold his shares, or any portion thereof; but at all events, the said Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, who is a man of great wealth, is liable, under the said subscription contract, for the full amount of the sums for which he has subscribed.

That your petitioners have no means of knowing whether the persons whose names appear on the said list deposited this session do or do not in fact hold shares in the said undertaking, or did hold them when the said list was deposited in the present session; but on the first allotment of the shares, your petitioners gave the subject the greatest care and consideration; and after the strictest examination and inquiry, they allowed only such persons to sign the said deed who they firmly and conscientiously believed were respectable persons, and well able to pay their calls in respect of the said shares, and that such persons who signed the said deed are still responsible for the calls on the said shares, although they may have since parted with them.

That in the first instance, and before the shares were sold at any premium, your petitioners allotted to such persons 9,000 shares; and that out of the reserve of 1,000 they have since allotted to landowners and others, who appeared to have claims on the company, other shares; but your petitioners never, as before stated, on any occasion received anything beyond the deposit of 5 *l.* per share; and your petitioners confidently assert, that the said subscription list for Stephenson's Line contains the names of some of the most wealthy and respectable men in the city of London, a fact, the correctness of which a perusal of the said list by any member of your honourable House will alone sufficiently prove.

That your petitioners, in making such deposit of their subscription lists this session, have adopted the course that was, as they are informed and believe, adopted in the Liverpool and Manchester, the Great Western, and the London and Birmingham Railway Bills, which after having failed in the first application to Parliament, afterwards, and in a subsequent session, succeeded in obtaining their respective Acts.

That your petitioners distinctly deny that there appear on the said list the names of persons who are not worthy of the credit of your honourable House, for the sums subscribed by them towards the said undertaking at the time of such subscription.

That the circumstances and facts stated in the petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats, if they were true, which your petitioners utterly deny, must have been known to the said James Sebastian Yeats (as to some) during the last session, and as to all those circumstances and facts at the commencement of the present session of Parliament.

That the said James Sebastian Yeats is the secretary, as well to the South Eastern, Lewes, Newhaven and Brighton Railway undertaking, as to the South Eastern and Dover Railway Company.

That previous to and during the progress in the last session of Parliament of the said Bill for making the said South Eastern and Dover Railway, and during the proceedings in this session on the several Brighton Bills, the directors of the said two, South Eastern and Dover,

No. 2. Petition of Provisional Committee.

Dover, South Eastern and Brighton Lines, and which are in truth and in fact one and the same set of parties, and Mr. Fearon, who is the solicitor to both companies, have repeatedly, and even so late as the 15th day of May instant, applied to your petitioners individually, and to them collectively as a body or company, to unite the said Stephenson's company with the said South Eastern and Dover Railway Company; and on its being stated to the said Mr. Fearon that such an union was impracticable, then the said Mr. Fearon proposed that some of your petitioners, as directors of Stephenson's Line, should become interested in and be members in the direction of the said South Eastern and Dover Company, in order to add, by their names and well-known wealth and respectability, "a moral influence" to the chance of the said South Eastern and Dover Company being able to make their said line; but your petitioners, on account of the magnitude of the works of the said South Eastern and Dover lines, and their belief in the insufficiency of the capital to complete those works, and the improbability of any adequate return for the outlay those works would require being ever obtained, declined to support the said undertaking; and your petitioners believe, that for this, and only this reason, the said South Eastern and Dover Railway Company have induced their secretary to present the petition hereinbefore referred to, as at the interview on the said 15th instant, which was attended by the said Mr. Fearon, a threat of the intended presentation of such petition was made previously to the application of the said Mr. Fearon to the directors of the said Stephenson's Brighton Line to take shares in and to become interested in the support of the said South Eastern and Dover Railway Company.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will be pleased to take such course with reference to the said petition of the said James Sebastian Yeats as shall appear just to your honourable House.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

(Copy.)

"London and Brighton Railway.

"I, Peter Kirk, of Carrickfergus, esq., M. P., do authorize Mr. Joseph Laurence to sign on my behalf the Parliamentary deed and shareholders' agreement for the ten 100*l.* shares I hold in this undertaking, and I request the certificates may be delivered to the above named party.

(signed) "*P. Kirk.*
"Residence, Carrickfergus.

"Mr. Richard Till, to
"The Secretary of the London and Brighton Railway."

Appendix, No. 3.

SUBSCRIBERS' CONTRACT.

No. 3. Subscribers' Contract.

This Indenture, made the 15th day of October 1835, between *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid*, of Champion-hill, Camberwell, in the county of Surrey, esq., and *William Routh*, of George-yard, Upper Thames-street, in the city of London, merchant, of the first part, *Richard Lambert Jones*, of Little Moorfields, Finsbury-square, in the city of London, house-agent, *Henry Templer*, of Green-street, Grosvenor-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., and *John Laurence*, of Russell-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., of the second part, and the several other persons whose names and seals are hereunto subscribed and affixed, of the third part, witnesseth, that the several persons parties hereto do hereby severally acknowledge and declare that they, together with the several other persons who have subscribed their names and affixed their seals to four certain other indentures, bearing even date, and of the same tenor, purport and effect with these presents, have respectively subscribed the several sums set opposite to their respective names so subscribed as aforesaid, for the purpose of constructing and establishing a railway, to be called by the name of "The London and Brighton Railway," or by such other name or names as may at any time hereafter be adopted by the provisional committee for the time being, acting on behalf of the said parties hereto and the other subscribers to the undertaking so subscribed for as herein mentioned, such railway to commence from the London and Southampton Railway at Wimbledon-common, in the county of Surrey, or from such other place in London, or not distant more than ten miles from London, as the said provisional committee for the time being shall think fit; and to terminate at Brighton, in the county of Sussex, or at such other place not distant more than ten miles from Brighton aforesaid, as the said committee for the time being shall think fit; to proceed from the commencement to the termination thereof by such course, and through such parishes, townships or places, as shall be approved of by such committee, together with such branches from the said railway to any towns or places or works lying at a distance, not exceeding ten miles from the main railway, by such routes respectively as may by the said committee be deemed expedient, and also with such works and buildings connected with

No. 3. Subscribers' Contract.

such railway and branches respectively, or any of them, as may by the said committee be deemed expedient; the same railway, branches and other works, or such part or parts thereof as shall be authorized by Parliament as hereinafter mentioned, to be constructed, established and conducted in such manner as shall be directed by any Act or Acts of Parliament to be applied for and obtained in the next or any subsequent session or sessions of Parliament, either by the said committee for the time being, or, after the first of such Acts, if more than one shall have passed, by the persons thereby authorized to act on behalf of the subscribers to the said undertaking; in which Act or Acts, or the first of such Acts, if more than one, it is intended to introduce, or to endeavour to procure to be introduced, a clause constituting the subscribers to the said undertaking a corporate body, or for otherwise preventing the several subscribers to and proprietors of shares in the said undertaking, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, from being liable in any event for any larger sum than that which has been subscribed by each of them as aforesaid. And the said several persons parties hereto do hereby declare, that the said committee for the time being shall have full power and authority to select, and from time to time to vary, within the respective limits hereinbefore referred to, as well the site or spot at which the said intended railway is or shall be intended to commence as the site or spot at which the same is or shall be intended to terminate; and also to select, and from time to time to vary, the intended intermediate course thereof, and the parishes, townships or places through which such railway is or shall be intended to be carried; and also from time to time to determine what branches shall be proposed to be made therefrom; and to select, and from time to time to vary, the course of such intended branches respectively; and also to select, and from time to time to vary, the extent and situation of the several works intended to be connected with such railway and branches respectively, or any of them; and to make, and from time to time to renew, applications to Parliament for an Act or Acts authorizing the execution of such intentions and determinations, or any of them, or of all or any of the purposes aforesaid, as they in their discretion shall think proper; and, if they shall think it expedient so to do, to abstain from making any application to Parliament in the next session, and to defer such application to such period as they shall think proper, and to confine their application to Parliament, in the next or any future session or sessions, to the main line of the said railway, or to any portion of such line, either with or without all or any of the branches therefrom, and to defer the application respecting the remaining portion of such main line, or any part or parts thereof, either with or without all or any of the said branches, or respecting all or any of the said branches only, to a future session or sessions of Parliament. And this Indenture further witnesseth, that every of them, the said *Richard Lambert Jones*, *Henry Templer* and *John Laurence*, the said parties hereto of the second part, for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and to the extent only of the sum set opposite to his name hereunder written, and not further or otherwise, and also every of them the said several persons parties hereto of the third part, for himself and herself, and for his and her respective heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and to the extent only of the sum set opposite to his or her name hereunder written, and not further or otherwise, doth by this deed or contract covenant with the said *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid* and *William Routh*, parties hereto of the first part, their executors and administrators, and each of them the said *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid* and *William Routh*, parties hereto of the first part, for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, and to the extent only of the sum set opposite to his name hereunder written, and not further or otherwise, doth by this deed or contract covenant with the said *Richard Lambert Jones*, *Henry Templer* and *John Laurence*, parties hereto of the second part, their executors and administrators, that they the said several persons parties hereto respectively, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, shall and will well and truly pay or cause to be paid the money subscribed by every of them respectively within three years from the date hereof, in such sums and to such persons, and at such places and times, as, until the passing of the said Act or Acts, shall be required by the said provisional committee, and, after the passing of the said Act or Acts, as the committee or other persons authorized by such Act or Acts shall direct or appoint. In witness whereof the said parties to these presents have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

Appendix, No. 4.

SUBSCRIBERS' AGREEMENT.

No. 4. Subscribers' Agreement.

We, the several persons who have hereunto subscribed our names, being severally subscribers to an undertaking for constructing and establishing a railway, to be called by the name of "The London and Brighton Railway," or by such other name or names as may be adopted at any time hereafter by the provisional committee hereinafter mentioned, and certain branches from the said railway, and certain works to be connected therewith, in addition to the declarations and covenants respectively made and entered into by us in regard to the said undertaking by five certain indentures of even date with these presents, do hereby, for ourselves severally and respectively, and for our several and respective heirs, executors

No. 4. Subscribers' Agreement.

executors and administrators, promise and agree, every of us, to and with the others of us, and their respective executors, administrators and assigns, that we severally and our several and respective executors, administrators and assigns, shall and will faithfully conform to and abide by the several rules and regulations hereinafter mentioned and set forth for the management and conduct of the said undertaking, until an Act or Acts of Parliament shall be obtained for that purpose; (that is to say,)

That the following persons shall be members of the provisional committee, to act on behalf of the said parties hereto and the other subscribers to the said undertaking; (that is to say), *Isaac Lyon Goldsmid*, of Champion-hill, Camberwell, in the county of Surrey, esq., *William Hichens*, of Threadneedle-street, in the city of London, stockbroker, *Richard Lambert Jones*, of Little Moorfields, Finsbury-square, in the said city of London, house-agent, *Thomas Read Kemp*, of Belgrave-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., *John Laurence*, of Russell-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., the Honourable *John Thornton Leslie Melville*, of Birchin-lane, in the said city of London, banker, *Robert Murray*, of Somerset-street, Portman-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., *Edward Horsley Palmer*, of King's Arms-yard, Coleman-street, in the said city of London, merchant, *William Routh*, of George-yard, Upper Thames-street, in the city of London, merchant, and *Henry Templer*, of Green-street, Grosvenor-square, in the said county of Middlesex, esq.; and also that any other person or persons shall be a member or members of the said provisional committee who may at any time or times hereafter be appointed by such provisional committee for the time being, out of the subscribers of the said undertaking, as a member or members of such committee, in lieu of any member or members thereof who may have died or resigned, or in addition to the existing number of members thereof; and that any member of the said provisional committee may cease to be a member thereof by sending in his resignation in writing to the secretary for the time being of the said committee.

That Messrs. *Williams, Deacon & Company*, of Birchin-lane, Cornhill, London, and Messrs. *Cocks, Biddulph & Company*, of Charing-cross, in the city and liberty of Westminster, in the county of Middlesex, shall, for the present, be the London bankers of the said undertaking; and Messrs. *Wigney & Company* shall, for the present, be the Brighton bankers of the said undertaking.

That Messrs. *Vizard & Leman*, of Lincoln's Inn Fields, in the county of Middlesex, shall, for the present, be the London solicitors of the said undertaking; and Messrs. *Attree, Clarke & M'Whinnie*, of Brighton, shall, for the present, be the Brighton solicitors of the said undertaking.

That Mr. *George Parker Bidder* shall, for the present, be the acting engineer, and Messrs. *G. & R. Stephenson* shall, for the present, be the consulting engineers of the said undertaking.

That the members for the time being of the said provisional committee, or some of them, shall meet from time to time for promoting the said undertaking, but that no business shall be transacted at any such meeting unless three members at least of the said committee shall be present thereat.

That the majority of members attending any meeting of the said committee, consisting of not less than three members, shall bind all the members thereof, whether present or absent; and the member in the chair at any such meeting shall, in all cases in which the votes shall happen to be equal, have a double or casting vote; and all acts which shall be decided on by a majority of votes at any such meeting shall, for the purposes of these presents, and of the said indentures of even date herewith, be considered as acts of the whole of the said committee.

That minutes of all the proceedings of every meeting of the said committee shall be entered in a book to be kept for that purpose, and shall be signed by the member in the chair at such meeting.

That the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power from time to time to appoint the sub-committees in Brighton, or elsewhere, delegating to such sub-committee such duties and powers as such provisional committee may think proper.

That the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power to carry the said undertaking into effect, and for that purpose to cause the requisite surveys to be made, to obtain estimates, to make arrangements, bargains and contracts with railway, canal and harbour proprietors, land-owners and any others with whom the said committee may find it expedient to make any arrangement, bargain or contract, and generally to adopt all measures which such committee, or any sub-committee appointed by them, may consider as necessary or expedient for obtaining an Act or Acts of Parliament for the establishment of the said undertaking or any part thereof, or for furthering or facilitating the progress of such Act or Acts through the Houses of Parliament, or either of them, in the success of the said undertaking.

That the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power to take offices for the business of the said undertaking, to appoint, suspend or remove the bankers, solicitors, engineers, surveyors, secretaries, clerks, agents, servants and workmen for to be employed in the said undertaking, and to pay and allow all such rent, salaries and recompence as the said provisional committee shall think right, and to enter into contracts and

No. 4
Subscribers' Agreement.

agreements for the said undertaking or any part thereof, and for the completion of the proposed surveys, and all other matters incident to obtaining the proposed Act or Acts of Parliament; and also to apply all or any part of the monies paid or to be paid by way of deposit, as hereinafter mentioned, in payment of all such rent, salaries, recompences and engagements as aforesaid, and of the expenses of applying for, soliciting and obtaining an Act or Acts of Parliament, as hereinbefore and in the said indentures of even date herewith is mentioned, and all other costs, charges and expenses incurred or to be incurred relative or incident to or for the benefit or advancement of the said undertaking, or which they have been or may be put to in respect or on account thereof, or relating thereto, whether such costs, charges and expenses have reference to the acts of the before-mentioned committee or any other committee or any member of the same respectively, and whether with reference to the present proposed or any other line or lines of railway from London to Brighton.

That the said provisional committee shall have full power from time to time to make and establish all such bye-laws and rules as they may think necessary or expedient for the good government of themselves and the said sub-committees.

That the monies already subscribed by the several subscribers to the said undertaking, and to be subscribed by any new subscribers thereto (all which monies are together to form a capital of 1,000,000*l.* sterling) shall be divided into shares of 100*l.* each, and shall be and be considered a fund applicable to the performance and fulfilment of all and every or any arrangement or arrangements, bargains, contracts or agreements entered into by the said provisional committee under the powers of or pursuant to this agreement, and generally for the carrying into effect the purposes of the said Act or Acts of Parliament.

That the said provisional committee will not recognise the transfer of any share or shares in the said undertaking until an Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the said undertaking or some part thereof shall have been obtained.

That the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power to raise such portion (if any) of the said capital of 1,000,000*l.* sterling as has already been subscribed for, or the deposit whereon may not be paid as hereinafter mentioned, or any part thereof, by allowing such persons as they shall think fit to become subscribers to and take shares in the said undertaking

That a deposit of 5*l.* per share shall be immediately paid by every of the said parties hereto (if any) who has not already paid such deposit, and that a like deposit shall be paid by every person who may hereafter become a subscriber to the said undertaking, at the time of his so subscribing; but that no further deposit or sum shall be called for on account of expenses or otherwise until an Act or Acts of Parliament for authorizing or establishing the said undertaking or some part thereof shall have been obtained.

That it shall be distinctly provided in such Act or Acts of Parliament that no call shall be made upon the subscribers to the said undertaking, or any of them, which shall exceed the sum of 10*l.* per share at any one call; and that there shall always be an interval of two months between every two calls.

That the said committee shall be empowered, if they shall see fit, to invest such deposits in the purchase of any of the Government or other public funds, or of Exchequer bills.

That the committee shall be accountable for all income and profit which may arise from any such purchase, but shall not be answerable for any loss, if any such shall be occasioned thereby.

That, except as herein or in the said indentures of even date herewith is otherwise provided, the said provisional committee for the time being shall have full power to cause or procure, or endeavour to cause or procure, to be inserted in such Act or Acts as aforesaid, all such clauses and provisions as they shall deem necessary or expedient for carrying into effect all or any of the arrangements, bargains, contracts or agreements that may be entered into by them under the powers of or pursuant to this agreement, as well as for enforcing payment of the monies so subscribed or to be subscribed as aforesaid; and for providing engines, carriages and machinery to be used on the said railroad, branches and works, and generally for managing the affairs of the said undertaking, or as they shall otherwise deem to be for the benefit of the said undertaking or of the subscribers thereto.

That in the event of the said application or applications to Parliament, in the next or any subsequent session or sessions thereof, being unsuccessful, all costs and expenses of every description already incurred or hereafter to be incurred, attending such application or applications and the said proposed undertaking or any part thereof, shall be paid and borne by the subscribers to the said undertaking rateably out of the deposit paid or to be paid by each person upon his or her shares. As witness their hands and seals, the 15th day of October 1835.

Appendix No. 5.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.	Seals.	RESIDENCE.	Quality or Calling of the Subscribers.	Sums Subscribed.	Witnesses' Names.
				£.	
Isaac L. Goldsmid	(L. S.)	Champion-hill, Camberwell, Surrey	esquire	120,000	
J. T. L. Melville	—	Birchin-lane and Roehampton	honourable	15,000	
Henry Templar	—	31, Green-street, Grosvenor-sq., & 1, Castle-court, Birchin-lane.	esquire	21,000	
William Routh	—	George-yard, Upper Thames-street, and of Blackheath, Kent.	merchant	21,000	
Richard L. Jones	—	Little Moor-fields, and Highbury Park, Middlesex.	estate agent	11,000	
Robert Murray	—	35, Somerset-street, Portman-square	esquire	21,000	
John Laurence	—	Russell-square	ditto	10,000	
Joseph Laurence	—	Auction Mart, and Blackheath	gentleman	10,000	
Alexander Henry	—	Birchin-lane, and Winchester-place, Pentonville.	merchant	1,000	
William Hichens	—	18, Threadneedle street, and Camberwell Grove.	broker	15,000	
William Vizard	—	16, New-street, Spring Gardens	gentleman	7,500	
L. M. Simon	—	10, Warnford-court, and 10, Paragon, Blackheath.	ditto	5,500	
L. Richardson	—	Stock Exchange, & St. Jermayne's-place, Blackheath.	gentleman	1,000	
Robert Hichens	—	18, Threadneedle-street, and Grove, East Dulwich.	broker	15,000	
Frederick Harrison	—	18, Threadneedle-street, and Muswell-hill.	ditto	5,000	
Thomas Manning	—	22, New Ormond-street, and Stock Exchange.	gentleman	500	
Adam Gordon	—	6, Old London-street, and Blackheath Park.	ditto	6,000	
Edward F. Starbuck	—	6, Old London-st., & 14 America-square.	merchant	2,300	
John Barton	—	Hampstead	gentleman	500	
J. W. Humphry	—	37, Old Jewry	ditto	1,000	
Charles T. Pearce	—	Auction Mart, and Peckham Rye, Surrey.	gentleman	5,000	John Underhay.
Jos. Wilson	—	Highbury Hill	esquire	4,500	
Frederick Secretan	—	Alliance Office, Bartholomew-lane, & Oxford-terrace, Edgeware-rd.	gentleman	2,000	
Andrew Smith	—	1, Birchin-lane, and 25, Penton-st.	broker	1,500	
John M. Pearce	—	Swithin's-lane, and Hampstead	solicitor	2,000	
John Whitmore	—	Auction Mart, & Clapham-common	gentleman	7,000	
Robert Prance	—	Stock Exchange, and Hampstead	ditto	2,500	
E. Eyton	—	Hornsey	broker	1,000	
Joseph Laurence	—	Auction Mart, and Blackheath	gentleman	7,000	
Joseph Pease	—	Feethams, Darlington	ditto	20,000	
Thomas Murdock	—	6, New Broad-street, and 8, Portland-place.	merchant	2,000	
Benjamin Laurence	—	5, Crown-court, Broad-street, and Hornsey.	ditto	2,000	
Charles Otway Mayne	—	19, Hanover-terrace, Regent's Park	gentleman	2,000	
William Rawlins	—	13, Liverpool-street	knight	500	
William Thompson	—	Upper Thames-street	merchant	3,000	
William Scott	—	Grove, Camberwell, and Stock Exchange.	gentleman	2,000	
Robert Moser	—	Upper Thames-street	merchant	4,000	
John Cattley	—	Queenhithe, and Highbury	ditto	5,000	
L. S. Baxendale	—	7, Great Winchester-street, and 36, Tavistock-square.	solicitor	2,000	
W. E. Ferrers	—	Croydon	merchant	2,000	
Stephen Cannon	—	Stock Exchange, and Woodbank, Gerrard's-cross.	gentleman	3,000	
James Hutchinson	—	Highbury Park	ditto	2,000	
A. F. Slade	—	Battersea, Surrey	ditto	1,000	
David Allan	—	Compton-terrace, Islington	merchant	500	
Joshua Hutchinson	—	Highbury Park, ditto	gentleman	1,000	
James Foster	—	Stamford-hill, Middlesex	ditto	4,000	

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.	Seals.	RESIDENCE.	Quality or Calling of the Subscribers.	Sums Subscribed.	Witnesses' Names.
				£.	
J. Horsley Palmer	(L. S)	King's Arms Yard	merchant	5,000	
George Crawshay	—	Upper Thames-street, & Montague-street, Russell square.	ditto	5,000	
William M. Millers	—	Grange-road, Bermondsey	gentleman	1,000	
Charles Webb	—	Balham, Surrey	ditto	500	
Alexander Doorman	—	8, Euston-square	merchant	1,500	
Edward Moser	—	17, King-street	ditto	500	
D. Banks	—	Sheerness	gentleman	1,000	
William Collins	—	2, Broad-street-buildings	merchant	1,000	
Robert Davies	—	Lloyd's, and Wandsworth-common	ditto	2,500	
Thomas Hathway	—	Cornhill, and Camberwell	newspaper agent	500	
J. H. Bradshaw	—	Hornsey, and 62, Lombard-street	banker	2,000	
John Meadows White	—	1, Frederick-place, Old Jewry, and 1, Paragon, Blackheath.	attorney	1,000	
George Laurence	—	6, Bury-court, St. Mary Axe, and Stamford-hill.	merchant	1,500	
George Pearce	—	2, Bank Chambers, Lothbury	insurance broker	2,000	
Edward Clark	—	5, Jeffery-square, and 39, Mincing-lane.	merchant	500	John Underhay.
John Lewis Rutley	—	Coldbath-row, Greenwich	gentleman	500	
William Bourne	—	Great Dover-street, Borough	ditto	500	
J. C. Lowell	—	13, Paragon, Blackheath, & 6, George-lane, City.	merchant	1,000	
Henry Carter	—	66, Lombard-street	gentleman	10,000	
William Crawshay	—	George-yard, Upper Thames-street, and Merthyr Tidvil.	iron-master	5,000	
Teynham	—	Carnegie-house, Kensington	gentleman	1,000	
F. Baildon	—	34, Highbury-place	ditto	1,000	
Henry Wheeler	—	Cannonbury-grove	ditto	1,000	
George Probyn	—	21, Bryanstone-square	esquire	5,000	
John Wray	—	6, Suffolk-place	barrister	1,000	
Richard E. Townshend	—	Springfield, Norwood	gentleman	4,000	
Charles Sutherland	—	Park-road, Blackheath	broker	2,000	
John Lock	—	Herne-hill, Surrey	gentleman	2,500	
John Pirie	—	Freeman's-court	merchant	2,000	
James Walkinshaw	—	10, Hanover-terrace, Regent's Park	ditto	2,000	Richard Till.
John Moser	—	17, King-street, Cheapside	broker	500	
Thomas Carter	—	32, Gordon-street, Gordon-square	gentleman	1,500	
John Scott	—	2, Alderman's-walk, and Upper Clapton.	merchant	2,000	
Charles M'Garel	—	14, Wimpole-street	ditto	4,000	
John Gunston	—	27, Upper Thames-street	ditto	7,000	
Wm. Haseldine Pepys	—	11, Earl's-terrace, Kensington	surgeons' instrument maker.	500	
James G. Gordon	—	19, Upper Gower-street	merchant	500	
J. Deacon	—	Birchin-lane, and Mabledon Park, Tonbridge.	banker	15,000	
Charles E. Mangles	—	Flexford House, Guildford	merchant	2,000	
William W. Hichens	—	Threadneedle-street, and Camberwell-grove.	broker	3,200	
John Laurence	—	Russell-square	esquire	3,200	
S. N. Barber	—	Denmark-hill, Camberwell	broker	5,000	
P. Cazenove	—	Upper Clapton, Middlesex	stockbroker	2,000	
R. Small	—	York-terrace, Regent's Park	merchant	2,000	John Underhay.
Joseph Laurence	—	Blackheath	gentleman	3,200	
W. Goldsmid	—	36, Bloomsbury-square	ditto	1,000	
George Webb	—	14, Surrey-square	stockbroker	1,500	
J. Solly, jun.	—	Chesnut-walk, Layton	merchant	2,500	
George Bayley	—	2, China-terrace, Kennington-road	gentleman	3,000	
William Borrodaile	—	Streatham, Surrey	ditto	1,500	
William Routh	—	George-yard, Upper Thames-street	merchant	1,200	
Arthur Savage	—	168, Fleet-street	gentleman	1,500	
W. A. Thomas	—	Highbury-grove, Middlesex, and 50, Threadneedle-street.	ditto	2,500	
Charles Hensley	—	Upper Clapton, Middlesex	ditto	2,000	
Frederick Robarts	—	North House, Regent's Park	ditto	3,500	
Edward Harrison	—	Berkeley-street, Berkeley-square	ditto	2,000	
Thomas Harrington	—	Brighton	esquire	12,000	
Joseph Tulley	—	Green's Hotel, Lincoln's inn-fields	merchant	9,000	
James Cousens	—	8, Paragon, Blackheath	wholesale tea-dealer.	1,500	
Robert Currey	—	Herne-hill, Dulwich	merchant	500	Richard Till.
Isaac L. Goldsmid	—	Dulwich-hill House	esquire	19,000	John Underhay.
T. Allen Shuter	—	Shad Thames, Southwark	merchant	2,000	Richard Till.
Archibald Hastie	—	3, West-street, Finsbury	ditto	2,000	

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.	Seals.	RESIDENCE.	Quality or Calling of the Subscribers.	Sums Subscribed.	Witnesses' Names.
				£.	
Leonard Redmayne	(L. S.)	176, Oxford-street	upholsterer	11,000	Henry Leman.
G. Hayward	—	172, Western-road, Brighton	gentleman	500	James Leman.
Edward Tyrrell	—	Ewell, Surrey	esquire	1,000	
Matthias Attwood	—	Gracechurch-street	banker	4,000	
J. T. L. Melville	—	Roehampton	ditto	1,700	
David Mocatta	—	22, Great Coram-street	architect	2,500	Richard Till.
Charles Harrison	—	34, Connaught-square	gentleman	2,000	
William Day	—	Isleworth	surgeon	1,000	
John Cass Birkinshaw	—	24, Alpha-road	engineer	500	
Richard Crawshay	—	Woningham Hall	iron-merchant	5,000	James Leman.
Joshua Walker	—	19, Grove-end-road	merchant	3,000	
Lagos	—	11, Park-crescent	Baron Lagos	10,000	John Underhay.
Charles Colwill	—	181, Western road, Brighton	linendraper	200	
William Reed	—	Ivy Cottage, Lambeth, Surrey	gentleman	2,000	
William Venables	—	Hill House, Tooting, ditto	merchant	2,500	Richard Till.
John Ashton Yates	—	12, Great Cumberland-place	gentleman	1,000	John Underhay.
Francis H Goldsmid	—	Champion-hill	barrister	6,000	
John Barclay	—	Hornsey-lane	gentleman	3,000	
James Block	—	Finchley	ditto	3,000	
Thomas Lodder	—	Southampton-buildings, Holborn	law stationer	1,000	
Thomas Fowler	—	Broad-street	banker	2,000	
M. A. Goldsmid	—	Gloucester-place, Portman-square	off. assignee	3,000	
T. Somers Cocks	—	Charing-cross	banker	2,500	
William Bruce	—	8, George-yard, Lombard-street	merchant	15,000	
John T. Selwood	—	Bridport, Dorset	gentleman	15,000	
Henry Templer	—	31, Green-street, Grosvenor-square	merchant	3,200	
James Austin	—	18, Acton-place, Kingsland-road	gentleman	5,000	
John Rae Reid	—	Pall-mall	baronet	1,000	
William Duff	—	Red Lion-square	gentleman	5,000	
R. F. Newman	—	Guildhall	ditto	500	
James Harby	—	Poplar	merchant	1,000	
Edward Howley Palmer	—	8, Old Burlington-street	ditto	8,200	Richard Till.
Joseph Hardcastle	—	35, Abchurch-lane	ditto	2,000	
Alfred Hardcastle	—	ditto	ditto	2,000	
Joshua Scholefield	—	Birmingham	gentleman	8,000	
Charles Barker	—	Birchin-lane	ditto	500	
John Scott	—	10, New Broad-street	surgeon	2,000	
Frederick Pattison	—	29, Welbeck-street	gentleman	1,000	
M. Wolverly Attwood	—	27, Gracechurch-street	ditto	4,000	
John Alleard	—	65, Lombard-street	ditto	1,000	
Ferdinand Slade	—	Battersea, Surrey	ditto	1,000	
Jeffery Cullen	—	5, Marlbro'-place, Old Kent-road	ditto	1,000	
Richard Fell	—	Uxbridge	mealman	1,000	
Samuel Gurney	—	Lombard-street	broker	5,000	
W. Stephens	—	80, Bishopsgate-street within	wine-merchant	1,000	
Cristobal de Murrieta	—	30, Tavistock-square	merchant	1,000	
Thomas Laurence	—	Lee-grove, Blackheath	gentleman	500	
Robert Walters	—	30, Lincoln's-inn-fields	barrister	1,000	John Underhay.
Edward Halse	—	34, Jewin-street	merchant	500	Jos. A. Lewis.
William Marshall	—	41, Upper Grosvenor-street	esquire	10,500	
Elias Mocatta, jun.	—	38, Chester-terrace	esquire	2,500	
Henry Aug. Templer	—	Bridport, Dorset	gentleman	10,000	
John Gandell	—	1, Mecklenburgh-street	merchant	2,000	Richard Till.
Samuel Hilbert Ellis	—	Keppel-street, Russell-square	gentleman	1,000	
Fermin de Tastet	—	Alderman's-walk	merchant	2,000	
William Tooke	—	12, Russell-square	solicitor	1,000	Jos. A. Lewis.
T. Bish	—	Cornhill	stockbroker	1,000	Richard Till.
Rob. Fred. Gower	—	28, Coleman-street	merchant	2,000	
J. Clayton Freeling	—	38, York-place	esquire	1,000	Jos. A. Lewis.
Anna Maria Goldsmid	—	Champion-hill	- - -	1,000	
Z. Laurence	—	37, Russell-square	merchant	2,000	
William Richardson	—	1, Wallbrook	solicitor	500	
S. A. Vardon	—	Oxford-terrace	gentleman	3,000	
John Louis Lemmé	—	1, Finsbury-terrace	merchant	2,000	
C. P. Marié de Buck	—	9, Kingsland-road	ditto	3,000	Richard Till.
Charles Few	—	Covent-garden	gentleman	5,000	
Thomas Hamilton	—	Henrietta-street, Covent-garden	ditto	2,500	
Robert Watkins	—	Arundel, Sussex	ditto	2,500	
William Reed	—	South Lambeth	ditto	2,500	
Edward Blount	—	Bryanstone-square	ditto	2,500	Jos. A. Lewis.
Richard Rayley	—	Lincoln's-inn	esquire	1,000	
Richard L. Jones	—	Highbury-park	ditto	1,200	Richard Till.
William Griffin	—	22, Cornhill	jeweller	100	
Thomas Wm. Clagett	—	Fetcham	gentleman	2,500	
Robert Moser	—	Upper Thames-street	iron-merchant	2,000	Jos. A. Lewis.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.	Seals.	RESIDENCE.	Quality or Calling of the Subscribers.	Sums Subscribed.	Witnesses' Names.
				£.	
Peter Kensett	(L. S.)	Billingshurst	grocer	300	
James W. Freshfield, jr.	—	New Bank-buildings		2,500	Richard Till.
William Stanley Clarke	—	Elm-bank, Leatherhead	esquire	4,000	
William Crawshay	—	Cyfarthfa, Cardiff	iron-master	5,000	J. Leman.
James Andrew	—	Ewell, Surrey	gentleman	500	J. H. Wright.
George Talbot	—	Hanover-square	baronet	1,000	Richard Till.
Richard L. Jones	—	Little Moor-fields	surveyor	5,000	
Frederick Swanwick	—	Bank of Manchester, Manchester	civil engineer	1,000	
Denzil Onslow	—	Staughton House, Hunts	general in the army	100	Jos. A. Lewis.
J. Hinxman	—	Great Russell-street, Bloomsbury-square.	gentleman	1,500	
W. Chadwick	—	Southwark	surveyor	1,000	Richard Till
F. Read	—	His Majesty's Customs	gentleman	500	
Robert Upperton	—	8, Lansdowne-place, Hove	solicitor	500	
Thomas Gotobed	—	82, Great Russell-square, Bloomsbury, London.	gentleman	500	
Richard Newnham	—	Steyne-lane, Brighton	surgeon	1,500	
Thomas Thorby	—	35, North-street, ditto	chemist	300	
Samuel Ridley	—	138, North-street, ditto	auctioneer	700	
Richard Stuckey	—	Albion Hotel, ditto	innkeeper	500	
William Lambert	—	62, Western-road, ditto	stonemason	500	
Anthony Lamprel	—	East-street, ditto	bath proprietor	200	
Edmund Savage	—	Pavilion Hotel, ditto	tavern-keeper	300	
John Yeates	—	18, York-place, ditto	brewer	2,500	
Jacob Boys	—	60, Grand-parade, ditto	solicitor	300	
John Lashmar	—	20, Middle-street, ditto	merchant	1,000	
Isaac Bass	—	Black Lion-street, ditto	ditto	2,000	
George Parsons	—	York Hotel, ditto	hotel-keeper	500	
John Labouchere	—	Birchin-lane, and 6, Upper Harley-street.	banker	15,000	
Charles Price	—	3, Old Steyne, Brighton	physician	1,500	
James Henry Mills	—	High-street, ditto	broker	300	
Jos. Parsons	—	Marine-parade, ditto	auctioneer	500	
Edward Butler	—	Gloucester-place, ditto	collector of rates	200	
L. E. Cohen	—	Clarence-place, ditto	printer	200	
John Hilton	—	Church-street, ditto	grocer	500	
John Good	—	East-street, ditto	hairdresser	200	John Underhay.
J. N. Wigney	—	Brunswick-square, ditto	banker	2,500	
J. Cordy	—	117, London-road, ditto	wine-merchant	500	
Emma Wright	—	Ditchling-road, ditto	spinster	500	
Charles Bellingham	—	9, Marine-parade, ditto	attorney	700	
Cordelia Walker	—	Royal York Hotel, ditto		100	
John Bradshaw	—	79, Western-road, ditto	tailor	500	
John Mills	—	St. George's-place, ditto	esquire	2,500	
Robert Taylor	—	28, Old Steyne, ditto	surgeon	1,000	
Richard Inman	—	40, St. James's-street, ditto	grocer	500	
Thomas Attree	—	Ship-street, ditto	solicitor	2,500	
Thomas Atkins Inman	—	Black Lion-street, ditto	merchant	500	
Harriet Swinley	—	Marine-parade, ditto	spinster	500	
J. H. Borrer	—	Gloucester-place, ditto	banker	500	
William Attree	—	West-hill Lodge, ditto	surgeon, &c. to the King.	500	
William Furner	—	1, Pavilion-parade, ditto	solicitor	500	
Edward Morling	—	22, Albion-street, ditto	brewer	100	
John Allfree	—	11, Gloster-place, ditto	schoolmaster	100	
F. R. Bonham	—	25, Dover-street, London	esquire	1,000	
Benjamin Wood	—	41, Clarence-place	plumber	500	
Edward Dubbins	—	Regent Cottage, Brighton	brewer	100	
Edward Everard	—	The Wick, Hove	D. D.	100	
Henry Cooper	—	Adelaide-crescent, Hove	gentleman	200	
William Acton	—	21, Brighton-place, Brighton	butcher	300	
Samuel Thompson	—	14, Clapham Rise, Surrey	gentleman	1,000	J. S. M'Whinnie.
George Harrington	—	Old Steyne, Brighton	ditto	2,500	Somers Clarke.
John Strachan	—	Old Ship Hotel, ditto	hotel-keeper	100	
John Allfree	—	Gloucester-place, ditto	schoolmaster	200	J. S. M'Whinnie.
E. G. Cuff	—	Old Ship Hotel, ditto	hotel-keeper	100	Somers Clarke.
Thomas Harrington	—	Old Steyne, ditto	gentleman	3,500	Frank A. Argles.
Hen. Fred. Stephenson	—	5, Arlington-street	esquire	2,500	Richard Till.
T. Allen Shuter	—	Southwark	merchant	500	
			TOTAL £.	861,400	